NINTH PROGRESS REPORT ON THE COMPENSATED WORK THERAPY (CWT) / VETERANS INDUSTRIES (VI) PROGRAM

FISCAL YEAR 2005

Sandra G. Resnick, Ph.D., Associate Director

Sharon Medak, Associate Project Director

Rick Baldino, Program Analyst

Linda Corwel, Program Analyst

Robert Rosenheck, MD, Director

Department of Veterans Affairs Northeast Program Evaluation Center (182)
VA Connecticut Healthcare System West Haven, CT 06516
(203) 937-3850
VA intranet: vaww.nepec.mentalhealth.med.va.gov

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Department of Veteran Affairs' (VA) Compensated Work Therapy (CWT) / Veterans Industries (VI) Program is a therapeutic work-for-pay program authorized in 1976 by Public Law 94-581. The major goals of the program are: 1) to use remunerative work to maximize a veteran's level of functioning; 2) to prepare veterans for successful re-entry into the community as productive citizens, and; 3) to provide a structured daily activity to those veterans with severe and chronic disabling physical and/or mental conditions. The program has grown substantially over the years from 76 programs in FY 1994 to 112 programs in FY 2005. During FY 2005, 13,850 veterans participated in the program, earning a total of $38 million dollars.

This report, the ninth in a series, offers information for program managers at the national, VISN, and the local program level.

During FY 2005, veterans entering the CWT Program averaged 48.1 years of age and 4.9% were female. Half of the veterans were African American (50.5%), 3.9% were Hispanic, 2.7% were of other ethnic backgrounds, and 42.9% were White. Eight percent were married; 63.3% were separated, widowed or divorced, and 28.6% had never married. Approximately 93% had completed 12 years of education, and 40.6% completed at least some college. Although 41.3% of veterans reported that their usual employment pattern in the past three years was full-time competitive employment, nine out of ten veterans (91.3%) reported not working at all in the month prior to admission. Veterans entering the CWT program have limited financial resources. Mean monthly incomes in the month prior to admission steadily dropped from $347 in FY 1993 to $208 in FY 2003 but rose slightly to $224 in FY 2004 and to $228 in FY 2005. Six out of ten veterans (64.4%) were homeless upon entry to CWT. Substance abuse is highly prevalent in this population – at admission, 86.6% of veterans were diagnosed with an alcohol problem and/or a drug problem and over half (56.3%) reported to have lost at least one job in the past due to their substance use. The proportion of veterans diagnosed with a serious mental illness or with a dual diagnosis (both a substance abuse disorder and a serious mental illness) is at its highest point since FY 1993: 53.4% of admitted veterans received a diagnosis of a serious mental illness, and 44.2% of veterans were dually diagnosed.

Veterans discharged during FY 2005 worked an average of 27 hours per week in CWT and had an average hourly wage of $6.07. The proportion of veterans who had any transitional work experience (TWE) while in CWT has more than doubled from FY 1993 (30.1%) to FY 2005 (82.9%). In FY 2005, workshop experiences were less common, with only 29.2% working in a workshop at least once. The majority of placements (both TWE and workshop) are on VA grounds.

Upon completion of their participation, four out of ten veterans had obtained competitive employment (full- or part-time). An additional 5.9% had arrangements at the time of discharge to be in some type of constructive activity (e.g. VA's Incentive

Therapy, student, trainee or unpaid volunteer) and 10.1% were retired and/or disabled. Since FY 1993 there has been an increase in the percentage of veterans rated as improved in virtually all clinical areas (e.g. alcohol problems, drug problems, mental health problems and medical problems) and work performance areas (e.g. attendance and punctuality, acceptance of supervision, relationship with co-workers, productivity and quality of production), although these percentages are relatively unchanged from FY 2003.

Performance as measured by 13 critical monitors was used to compare the operation of individual sites and to identify performance outliers. The norm used to evaluate the performance of individual sites on each critical monitor was either the national program mean, or in the case of outcome measures, the national median. Outcome measures were risk adjusted for differences in baseline veteran characteristics that are related to the outcomes. Eleven of the 96 programs for which data are presented were outliers on 6 or more of the 13 critical monitors.

Comprehensive workload data summaries for VA's entire Psychosocial Rehabilitation Service (PSR), using data from the outpatient care file in Austin, Texas, indicate that altogether 40,329 individual veterans received PSR services during FY 2005 and 23,286 of them (57.7%) received services from the either the CWT or CWT/TR programs.

As VA continues to shift its emphasis of care from costly hospital-based treatment to community care, participation in CWT will continue to be an important element in fostering community adjustment and functional rehabilitation of veterans disabled by psychiatric or addictive disorders, particularly CWT transitional work placements that are community-based, and CWT Supported Employment, a vocational service recently added to the array of CWT services.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

A. The Compensated Work Therapy / Veterans Industries Program

The Department of Veteran Affairs' (VA) Compensated Work Therapy (CWT) / Veterans Industries (VI) Program is a therapeutic work-for-pay program in which private sector businesses, or Federal Agencies, contract with VA for work to be performed by veterans. Authorized in 1976 by Public Law 94-581, the major goals of the program are: 1) to use remunerative work to maximize a veteran's level of functioning; 2) to prepare veterans for successful re-entry into the community as productive citizens, and; 3) to provide a structured daily activity to those veterans with severe and chronic disabling physical and/or mental conditions (Fountaine & Howard, 1987).

The CWT Program has grown substantially over the years from 76 programs in FY 1994 to 112 operating programs in FY 2005. Recent funding initiatives have added another 25 new CWT programs, which will be operational in FY 2006; and allowed existing sites to provide supported employment services.

During FY 2005, VA Central Office reported that 13,850 veterans had been served in the program and these veterans had earned a total of $38 million dollars through their participation in CWT. As VA continues to shift its emphasis of care from hospital and clinic-based treatment to community care, participation in CWT continues to be an important element in veterans' overall rehabilitation treatment plan.

The CWT program provides a continuum of services, with three basic types of work therapy models. The first and most popular is a transitional employment model called transitional work experiences (TWE). To date, most TWE sites have been located in government settings, usually the local VA medical center, but there are an increasing number of placements located in community businesses. CWT staff contract with employers to create individual placements, often to perform a particular task. Veterans participating in TWE placements receive direct supervision from the employer, but are paid by the CWT program via the STRAF account. CWT clinicians visit the placement site regularly and provide additional supervision as needed. The second work therapy model is participation in workshop-based sheltered employment. Work performed in the workshop most often involves assembly, packaging, collating and/or fabrication, although some sites operate workshops in which veterans learn advanced skills such as woodworking. Veterans are either paid on a piece rate basis or receive an hourly wage. Supported employment (SE) services have recently been added to the CWT program continuum. In SE, once an individual has expressed an interest in working, employment specialists provide assistance in identifying and obtaining competitive jobs based on individualized preferences and skills, and then provide ongoing support and vocational assistance (Becker & Drake, 2003).

B. Organization of the Veterans Health Administration

The Veterans Health Administration (VHA) is organized into 21 semi-autonomous Veterans Integrated Service Networks (VISNs)[1]. Each VISN is charged with developing cost-effective health care programs that are responsive both to the national mission of VA, and to local circumstances and trends in health care delivery. Although administered independently, the VISNs are also accountable through centralized monitoring of performance and health care outcomes. This report, the ninth in a series of performance reports, offers information for program managers at the national level, VISN level and the local program level.

C. Evaluation and Monitoring Efforts

Since 1993 the Northeast Program Evaluation Center (NEPEC) in West Haven, CT has monitored the CWT Program. The goals of the monitoring are to 1) provide a description of the status and needs of veterans currently in CWT, 2) assure program accountability, and 3) identify ways to refine or change the program, both nationally and/or at specific sites.

Tracking the ongoing performance of CWT program is accomplished through collecting information on every veteran who participates in CWT treatment. The Veteran Industries Monitoring Data Sheet (see Appendix A) is completed on every veteran admitted to the CWT program. Implemented on June 1, 1993 and revised in September, 2000, the form consists of two sections. The first section is completed on or as near to the day of admission to CWT as possible. Based on information obtained in a face-to-face interview with the veteran, CWT clinicians record veteran demographic and military service characteristics as well as residential, vocational and income status. At the end of the first section, clinicians record the avenue of entry into the CWT program and the veteran's psychiatric and medical status. The second section is completed at the conclusion of CWT treatment. The clinician records the veteran's length of participation, type of discharge, total earnings, hours worked, and the veteran's arrangements for employment and housing after discharge. In addition, CWT clinicians record their impressions of clinical change (deteriorated, unchanged or improved) in six work performance areas and four clinical areas.

---

[1] During FY 2002, VISNs 13 and 14 dissolved and merged into one VISN, VISN 23.

1. Data Used to Assess CWT Program Performance

The performance of each CWT program is assessed with three types of measures that reflect essential aspects of program operation:

> The **program monitoring compliance measure** assesses compliance of individual CWT programs with the collection of monitoring data.

> **Descriptive measures** provide basic information on the characteristics of the veterans served by the program (e.g. age, marital status, race, etc) or what veterans do while in the program (e.g., hours worked, wages earned, etc.).

> **Outcome measures** provide information about veterans' status upon discharge from the program.

> Some descriptive and outcome measures are also considered to be **critical monitor measures.** These measures evaluate how successful programs are at meeting the goals and objectives of the CWT Program as set forth by programmatic guidelines. Critical monitors are used to identify sites whose performance is substantially different from other sites.

2. Selection of Critical Monitors

Outlined below are three objectives that reflect the goals of the CWT Program. For each objective, the associated critical monitors are noted. The critical monitors cover three principal areas: 1) veteran characteristics (the extent to which the CWT Program reaches the seriously mentally ill veteran population); 2) program participation (i.e. type of discharge, hours worked, hourly wage); and 3) outcomes (i.e. employment arrangements at the time of discharge, percent clinically improved).

Objective 1: The CWT Program serves veterans with psychological or physical disabilities, particularly the underserved disabled veteran population.

Critical monitor selected to assess this objective is:
- Percent of veterans with a serious mental illness

Objective 2: The CWT Program provides psychosocial (or physical) rehabilitation through remunerative work to veterans in order to encourage the development of good work habits, emphasizing attendance, reliability, punctuality, productivity, craftsmanship, creativity, personal responsibilities and acceptance of supervision.

Critical monitors selected to assess this objective are:
- Percent of veterans who had a mutually agreed/planned discharge from CWT
- Percent of veterans who failed to comply with CWT program requirements
- Average hours worked per week
- Average hourly wage

Objective 3: The CWT Program provides treatment directed towards increasing the veteran's chances for adjustment and reentry into the community, including returning to the workforce and, preventing deterioration of medical, psychiatric and substance abuse problems.

Critical monitors selected to assess this objective are:
- Average work improvement score
- Among veterans with alcohol problems, percent improved
- Among veterans with drug problems, percent improved
- Among veterans with mental health problems, percent improved
- Among veterans with medical problems, percent improved
- Percent competitively employed (part- or full-time) after discharge
- Percent unemployed after discharge
- Percent employment status unknown after discharge

3. Determining Outliers on Critical Monitors

Generally, the average (or median) of all CWT sites is used as the norm for evaluating the performance of each individual site. On descriptive measures, those sites that are one standard deviation above or below the mean in the *undesirable* direction are considered outliers. Outcome measures are risk adjusted for baseline characteristics. Selection of these baseline characteristics differs depending on the outcome measure, but they include age, race, marital status, education, previous employment history, receipt of disability benefits, history of psychiatric hospitalizations, and clinical psychiatric diagnoses, including serious psychiatric illnesses and substance abuse problems. Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the *undesirable* direction after adjusting for baseline measures are considered outliers.

The identification of a site as an outlier on a critical monitor is intended to inform the program director, medical center leadership, network leadership and VA Central Office that the site is divergent from other sites with respect to the critical monitor. Each site is asked to carefully consider the measures on which they are outliers. In some instances this information is used to take corrective action in order to align the site more closely with the mission and goals of the program. In other instances sites have been identified as outliers because of legitimate idiosyncrasies in the operation of the program, which do not warrant corrective action. **It must be emphasized that these monitors should not be considered, by themselves, to be indicators of the quality of care delivered at particular sites.** They can be used only to identify statistical outliers, the importance of which must be determined by further discussion.

4. Overview of the Monitoring Process

Forms are completed on each veteran discharged from the CWT program and are submitted monthly to NEPEC by program sites. These data are aggregated and reported back to sites on a quarterly basis. Before this progress report was issued, preliminary tables were distributed to all CWT program sites, and CWT program coordinators and staff were asked to review all tables for errors. VA Central Office has also reviewed data presented in this report. Data have been corrected or amended where appropriate.

5. CWT as A Component of the VA Psychosocial Rehabilitation Service

The CWT Program is only one component of the larger VA Psychosocial Rehabilitation Service (PSR), a section of the Mental Health Strategic Health Group. Other programs within PSR include Compensated Work Therapy / Transitional Residence (CWT/TR)[2], Incentive Therapy (IT)[3] and Vocational Assistance / Counseling.

Data corresponding to 9 stop codes from VA's outpatient care file in Austin Texas were also obtained: 574 (mental health - CWT), 532 (psychosocial rehab-individual; used in the CWT/TR program), 559 (psychosocial rehab-group; used in the CWT/TR program), 208 (rehab medicine – CWT), 573 (Incentive Therapy – group), 207 (rehab medicine – Incentive Therapy), 535 (mental health - vocational assistance), 575 (mental health – vocational assistance group) and 213 (rehab medicine – vocational assistance).

6. National Staffing Report for the First Half of FY 2005

In this report we introduce a new set of tables which are designed to monitor staffing patterns in CWT programs. These tables track staffing and staff-related program costs. These tables document the expansion of the CWT program under recent mental health initiatives to increase psychosocial rehabilitation services in VHA. It should be noted that because these are new data, the accuracy is uncertain. We are presenting these tables here for feedback and refinement of definitions and methods.

---

[2] The CWT/TR program is a work-based Psychosocial Residential Rehabilitation Treatment Program (PRRTP)
offering a 24-hour setting for veterans involved in CWT. The program utilizes a residential community, peer and professional support, with a strong emphasis on increasing personal responsibility. Veterans contribute (using their CWT earnings) to the cost of operating and maintaining the residences and are responsible for planning purchasing and preparing their own meals. For more information on the CWT/TR program see the Sixth Progress Report on the Compensated Work Therapy / Transitional Residence Program, Resnick, Sieffert, Medak and Rosenheck, 2004).
[3] Incentive Therapy program provides pre-vocational activity combined with intensive case management. This program is designed for veterans requiring a long term highly structured pre-vocational environment.

D. Organization of This Report

This report is divided into two sections. The first section examines changes in the program, over time, from FY 1993 when the monitoring first began through to FY 2005. In addition, data on critical monitors are presented by VISN, and finally, site data is presented on the descriptive characteristics of veterans admitted to the program, the extent to which veterans participated in the program and veteran outcomes at the time of discharge.

The second section of this report contains four appendices. Appendix A contains a copy of the monitoring data collection form. Appendix B contains 37 data tables derived from the monitoring data collection system, Appendix C contains summary data of the psychosocial rehabilitation services received by veterans as documented by stop codes recorded in VA's outpatient treatment file in Austin, Texas during FY 2005. Finally, Appendix D presents staffing and cost data compiled from NEPEC'S National Staffing Report for the first half of FY 2005.

CHAPTER II: THE CLINICAL OPERATION

A. National Performance

Tables 1 - 6 in Appendix B present summary national data on the number of veterans served for whom monitoring data were collected, veteran characteristics, program participation, and discharge outcomes for fiscal years 1993 - 2005. Highlighted below are key findings:

Number of Veterans Served

- During FY 2005, data were collected on 8,078 veterans discharged from the CWT Program, which are 89.3 of all discharges reported to VA Central Office (Table 10).

Veteran Characteristics

The majority of veterans admitted to the CWT Program are referred by either VA outpatient programs or domiciliary care programs (42.4% and 32.5% respectively; Table 2).

- During FY 2005, veterans in the CWT Program averaged 48.1 years of age and 4.9% were female. Half of the veterans were African American (50.5%), 3.9% were Hispanic, 2.7% were of other ethnic backgrounds, and 42.9% were White. Only 8.2% were married; 63.3% were separated, widowed or divorced, and 28.6% had never married. Approximately 93% completed 12 years of education, and 40.6% completed at least some college (Table 2).

- Veterans admitted to the CWT continued to have limited financial resources. Mean monthly incomes in the month prior to admission steadily dropped from $347 in FY 1993 to $208 in FY 2003, but have risen slowly since then to $228 during FY2005. More than six out of ten veterans admitted to CWT (64.4%) were homeless when last living in the community (Table 3).

- In FY 2005, 41.3% of veterans entering the CWT program reported that their usual employment pattern in the past three years was full-time competitive employment, but nine out of ten veterans (91.3%) reported not working at all in the month prior to admission.

- Substance abuse is highly prevalent in this population – at admission, 86.6% of veterans were diagnosed with a substance abuse problem: 73.3% reported problems with alcohol and 64.4% reported a drug problem (Table 4). In addition, over half of veterans (56.3%) reported that they had lost at least one job due to substance abuse (Table 3).

7

- The proportion of veterans diagnosed with a serious mental illness or with a dual diagnosis (both a substance abuse disorder and a serious mental illness) is at its highest point since FY 1993: 53.4% of admitted veterans received a diagnosis of a serious mental illness, and 44.2% of veterans were dually diagnosed. (Table 4).

- Over half of the veterans in the CWT Program (60.9%) were reported to have a disabling medical condition (Table 4).

Program Participation

- Over half of veterans (53.4%) discharged during FY 2005 were judged by program staff to have successfully completed the program (Table 5).
- During FY 2005, veterans worked an average of 27 hours per week in CWT and had an average hourly wage of $6.07, 92 cents above the current federal minimum wage of $5.15/hour (Table 5).
- The proportion of veterans who had any TWE while in CWT has more than doubled from FY 1993 (30.1%) to FY 2005 (82.9%). Workshop experiences were less common, with 29.2% working in a workshop at least once. (Table 5)
- The majority of placements (both TWE and workshop) are on VA grounds. Over two-thirds (70.6%) of veterans worked in a TWE placement at the VA compared with 16.6% who worked at a TWE in the community. Fewer than one in four (23.3%) veterans participated in a workshop on VA grounds (Table 5).

Outcomes

- During FY 2005, 40.6% of veterans were discharged from CWT with arrangements to be in competitive employment (full- or part-time). An additional 5.9% had arrangements at the time of discharge to be in some type of constructive activity (e.g. VA's Incentive Therapy, student, trainee or unpaid volunteer) and 10.1% were retired and/or disabled (Table 6).
- Since the first progress report there has been an increase in the percentage of veterans rated as improved in virtually all clinical areas (e.g. alcohol problems, drug problems, mental health problems and medical problems) and work performance areas (e.g. attendance and punctuality, acceptance of supervision, relationship with co-workers, productivity and quality of production), although these percentages have remained relatively unchanged from FY 2002 to FY 2005 (Table 6).

Staffing

- Across all programs, there were a total of 376.95 filled FTEE positions, and 1000 additional hours worked by contracted staff. Total FTEE expenditures were over $13.7 million, with an additional $271 thousand for contracted staff. Average expenditures per VISN were $652,721 for FTEE, and almost $13 thousand for contracted staff.

- VISN 19 had the fewest FTEE (4.20) and VISN 17 the greatest (38.87), with an average of 17.95 FTEE per VISN. Twelve of the 21 VISNs had hired contract staff.

- Among facilities, the Greater Los Angeles Healthcare system had the greatest number of FTEE with 13.84 time-adjusted FTEE. Almost 25% ($n = 27$) of programs had 1 or fewer FTEE.

- Sites averaged 44.5 staff hours per week in the provision of TWE, 40.6 staff hours per week in administrative, educational or supervisory activities, 12 staff hours per week in SE, and 5.2 staff hours per week providing workshop or job readiness.

B. VISN Performance

There are CWT Programs located within every VISN. Tables 7, 8a and 8b provide data from FY 2005 on the 13 critical monitor measures organized by VISN. VISNs whose results are considered "outliers" are identified in Tables 7 and 8b with a shaded box. The performance of all VISNs is used as the norm for evaluating the performance of each individual VISN. Those VISNs that are one standard deviation above or below the mean in the undesirable direction are considered outliers in Table 7. Outcome measures are presented in Tables 8a and 8b. Table 8a reports the raw outcome data by VISN and Table 8b report the same outcome measures, however, they have been risk adjusted using the same baseline characteristics as described earlier for CWT sites (see Chapter I - determining outliers on critical monitors). VISNs that are statistically different in the undesirable direction from the median VISN after risk adjustment are considered outliers.

Table 9 provides a summary of the outlier status of each VISN. A total of 46 outliers out of a total of 286 measurements were identified for the 13 critical monitors across all 22 reporting VISNs. The greatest numbers of outliers are in VISNs 1 and 17.

C. Site Performance

1. Compliance with Program Monitoring

As a matter of policy, CWT sites are required to submit an Annual Report to VACO by the tenth day of the completion of each fiscal year. Table 10 of Appendix C compares the number of discharges reported in the FY 2005 Annual Report to VA Central Office with the number of monitoring forms NEPEC received where the last date worked in CWT occurred during FY 2005. In Table 10, (including Brockton, Orlando, and the downtown

Dallas programs whose VACO data are combined), a total of 112 CWT program site locations are listed:
- All 112 sites reported discharges to either VACO or NEPEC, and thus were considered to be operational.

- Wilkes-Barre, Birmingham, Miami, Marion, Columbia, MO, St. Louis, Roseburg, Walla Walla, West LA, Sepulveda and Knoxville submitted discharges to VACO but did not submit any monitoring data to NEPEC.
- Sites submitted monitoring data on 89.3% (site average) of the discharges they reported in their FY 2005 Annual Report. Fifteen CWT program site locations were at least one standard deviation below the mean on proportion of discharges during FY 2005 for which monitoring data were collected.

2. Descriptive Program Measures and Critical Monitor Measures

Tables 11 - 35 report site-specific data for FY 2005. Of the 112 operational sites, data are presented for 96 programs: Sixteen CWT program sites were excluded from these tables because during FY 2005 they submitted either no data or data on fewer than 10 veterans.[4] Critical monitors have been identified in these tables by shaded column titles (e.g. see Table 27 the column labeled "Mutually Agreed/Planned Discharge") and sites whose results are considered "outliers" are identified with a shaded box.

Table 36 provides a summary of the outlier status of each site location. A total of 233 outliers out of 1,248 measurements were identified for the 13 critical monitors across all 96 CWT program site locations. Forty-two of the 96 reporting sites (43.8%) were found to be outliers on one or none of the critical monitors, and 19 of the 96 (19.8%) program site locations were outliers on five or more of the 13 critical monitors.

3. Trend Data on Risk Adjusted Outcome Critical Monitors

The last set of tables in Appendix B, Tables 37a – 37h provide trend data on outcome measures. For each of the eight risk adjusted critical outcome monitors, data from FY 2005 are presented by site with comparative data from previous progress reports (FY1996 and FY1998 through FY 2005).

---

[4] The CWT site locations excluded from the data tables because no forms were submitted to NEPEC are: Wilkes-Barre, PA (VISN 4); Birmingham, AL (VISN 7); Miami, FL (VISN 8); Marion, IN (VISN 11); Columbia and St. Louis, MO (VISN 15); Roseburg/Eugene, OR and Walla Walla, WA (VISN 20); West LA, and Sepulveda, CA (VISN 22) and Knoxville, IA (VISN 23). Additionally, Togus, ME (VISN 1); Columbus, OH (VISN 10); Poplar Bluff (VISN 15); El Paso, TX (VISN 18) and Colorado Springs, CO (VISN 19) were excluded because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges for FY05.

D. The CWT Program as One Component of the Larger VA Psychosocial Rehabilitation Service

Appendix C contains 10 tables summarizing stop code data (see Chapter I) for Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services (PSR), as documented in VA's outpatient care file. Appendix C1 – Appendix C.5 present summary VISN data, while Appendix C.6 – Appendix C.10 present summary site data.

Altogether, 40,329 individual veterans received PSR services during FY 2005 and these veterans, on average, received 20.3 PSR visits. The overall duration of veteran participation in PSR was close to 3 months (mean = 82.4 days) as determined by dates of their first recorded and last recorded stop codes during FY 2005. Of the 40,329 veterans, 57.7% (n=23,286) received CWT and/or CWT/TR services; 56.5% (n=22,784) received vocational assistance services and 21.0% (n=8,456) received Incentive Therapy services.

Because veterans may receive treatment from a number of programs within the PSR continuum of care, Appendices C5 and C10 report the type service the veterans first received in the PSR continuum of care. Overall, 47.1% of veterans received CWT and/or CWT/TR services first, 42.5% of veterans received vocational assistance services first and 12.6% of veterans received Incentive Therapy services first.

E. Summary

As VA continues to shift its emphasis of care from costly hospital-based treatment to community care, participation in CWT will continue to be an important element in fostering community adjustment and functional rehabilitation of veterans disabled by psychiatric or addictive disorders, particularly CWT transitional work placements that are community-based, and CWT Supported Employment, a vocational service recently added to the array of CWT services.

REFERENCES

Fountaine and Howard. Program Evaluation of the Veterans Administrations Therapeutic Work Programs. Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation Studies and Evaluation Service, Veterans Administration, December 1987.

Becker, D. R., & Drake, R. E. (2003). *A working life for people with severe mental illness*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Leda, C., Rosenheck, R., Corwel, L. and Medak, S. Preliminary Information on the Monitoring Efforts of the Compensated Work Therapy Program. West Haven, CT; Northeast Program Evaluation Center, 1995.

Resnick, S., Sieffert, D., Medak, S, and Rosenheck, R. Sixth Progress Report on the Compensated Work Therapy / Transitional Residence Program. West Haven, CT; Northeast Program Evaluation Center, 2004.

Seibyl, C., Baldino, R., Corwel, L., Medak, S. and Rosenheck, R. Fourth Progress Report on the Compensated Work Therapy (CWT) / Veterans Industries (VI) Program Fiscal Year 2000. West Haven, CT; Northeast Program Evaluation Center, 2001.

Seibyl, C.L., Rosenheck, R., Corwel, L. and Medak, S. Compensated Work Therapy (CWT) / Veterans Industries (VI) Fiscal Year 1996. West Haven, CT; Northeast Program Evaluation Center, 1997.

Seibyl, C.L., Rosenheck, R., Corwel, L. and Medak, S. Second Progress Report on the Compensated Work Therapy (CWT) / Veterans Industries (VI) Fiscal Year 1998. West Haven, CT; Northeast Program Evaluation Center, 1999.

Seibyl, C.L., Rosenheck, R., Corwel, L. and Medak, S. Third Progress Report on the Compensated Work Therapy (CWT) / Veterans Industries (VI) Fiscal Year 1999. West Haven, CT; Northeast Program Evaluation Center, 2000.

Seibyl, C.L., Sieffert, D., Medak, S. and Rosenheck, R. Fifth Progress Report on the Compensated Work Therapy / Transitional Residence Program. West Haven, CT; Northeast Program Evaluation Center, 2002.

APPENDICES

Contents of the Appendices:

Appendix A. Veterans Industries Monitoring Data Sheet (Third Version)

Appendix B. CWT Monitoring Data Tables

Appendix C. Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Data Tables

Appendix D. National Staffing Report Tables for the First Half of FY 2005

Appendix A: Veterans Industries Monitoring Data Sheet (Third Version)

Veterans Industries
Monitoring Data Sheet
(Third Version-Revised 9/2000)
Page 1 of 5

FORM _VI_   **(2)**

COMPLETE THIS SECTION AT ADMISSION

Staff Member's Name _____

Admission Date to VI (mm,dd,yy) . . . . □□/□□/□□ **(8)**

VA Facility Name _____ VA Facility Code . . . . □□□ **(11)**

Two-character alphanumeric station code suffix (if applicable) . . . . □□ **(13)**

VI (or CWT) Subdivision Code (do not use unless you have registered a subdivision and have received a formal subdivision code from NEPEC). . . . . □ **(14)**

PART I INTERVIEW (to be administered to veteran by a clinician)

A. VETERAN DESCRIPTION

1. Veteran's Name (last name, first initial) □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ **(34)**

2. Social Security Number. . . . . □□□-□□-□□□□ **(43)**

3. Date of Birth (mm,dd,yy) . . . . □□/□□/□□ **(49)**

4. Sex **(50)**
     □ 1. Male   □ 2. Female

5. Ethnicity (check only one) **(51)**
     □ 1. Hispanic, white   □ 4. Black, not Hispanic   □ 6. White
     □ 2. Hispanic, black   □ 5. Asian   □ 7. Other
     □ 3. American Indian or Alaskan

6. Marital status (check only one) **(52)**
     □ 1. married   □ 3. widowed   □ 5. divorced
     □ 2. remarried   □ 4. separated   □ 6. never married

53–56 BLANK

9. Have you ever worked in VI (or CWT) before this admission? . . . . □ 0 = No □ 1 = Yes **(57)**

10. What was the highest level you completed in school **(e.g. GED = 12; 1 yr of college = 13)**? □□ **(59)**

11. How many months of training or technical education have you completed (exclude training in the military)? . . . . (mos) □□ **(61)**

B. EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME HISTORY

12. In your lifetime, what was the year you had your greatest employment earnings? . . . . (year) 19/20 □□ **(63)**

13. Approximately, how much were your employment earnings in that year ($/year)? (dollar amount only — no cents) . . . . $ □□□,□□□ **(69)**

70–75 BLANK

16. What has been your **usual** employment pattern during the **past three years**? (check only one) **(76)**
     □ 1. Full time (regular; ≥ 35 hrs/wk)   □ 5. Service/Volunteer
     □ 2. Regular part time (< 35 hrs/wk)   □ 6. Retired/disabled
     □ 3. Irregular part time (day jobs)   □ 7. Unemployed
     □ 4. Student/training program   □ 8. Other

17. What year was the last time you held a job in the community for a month or more? . . . . . . (year) 19/20 □□ **(78)**

79–82 BLANK

19. In the last 30 days, how many days did you work for pay? (exclude VI and IT) . . . . (days) □□ **(84)**

20. In the last 30 days, how much money did you receive from employment? (exclude VI and IT) (dollar amount only — no cents) . . . . $ □□□□ **(88)**

For office use only

21. Do you currently receive any of the following kinds of financial support?
(check one box for each question)
1. Service Connected Psychiatry (include 0%)...... ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes **(89)**
2. Service Connected Other (include 0%)......... ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes
3. NSC Pension................................. ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes
4. SSDI (Social Security Disability Insurance)..... ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes
5. SSI (Supplemental Security Income)........... ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes
6. Social Security Retirement.................... ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes
7. Other disability (e.g. workmen's compensation).. ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes
8. Other public support (e.g. food stamps, general relief)...... ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes **(96)**

22. In the past 30 days, how much money did you receive from these sources (dollar amount —
no cents) (code 0000 if veteran does not receive financial support from any of the above)?. $ ☐☐☐☐ **(100)**

C. MILITARY HISTORY

23. Period of Service (check **longest** one) **(101)**
❑ 1. Pre-WWII (11/18–11/41) ❑ 5. Between Korean and ❑ 7. Post-Vietnam Era (5/75–7/90)
❑ 2. World War II (12/41–12/46) Vietnam Eras (2/55–7/64) ❑ 8. Persian Gulf (8/90–   )
❑ 3. Pre-Korean War (1/47–6/50) ❑ 6. Vietnam Era (8/64–4/75) ❑ 9. Post-Persian Gulf
❑ 4. Korean War (7/50–1/55)

24. Did you ever receive hostile or friendly fire in combat zone?...... ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes **(102)**

D. LIVING SITUATION

25. Where did you usually sleep during the month before you were admitted to the VI (or CWT) program? (select one) **(103)**
❑ 1. own apartment, room or house ❑ 5. halfway house, transitional living facility
(include boarding home) ❑ 6. hotel, Single Room Occupancy (SRO)
❑ 2. someone else's apartment, room or house ❑ 7. shelter for the homeless
❑ 3. hospital or nursing home ❑ 8. outdoors, abandoned building, car
❑ 4. domiciliary ❑ 9. other (specify _____)

DO NOT CODE ☐☐ **(105)**

26. On the last date you were living in the community (e.g. not in a hospital or a health care
type institution) were you homeless **(lacking a fixed, regular and adequate night-time
residence)** ...... ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes **(106)**

107–109 BLANK

26b. How long was that episode of homelessness (select one)?
**[Note: Length of time homeless is determined by figuring the number of months or
years since the veteran last had a fixed, regular and adequate night-time residence,
minus the time spent in any institution (hospital, halfway house, jail etc.)]** **(110)**
❑ 1. less than 1 month ❑ 4. at least 1 year but less than 2 years
❑ 2. at least 1 month but less than 6 months ❑ 5. two years or more
❑ 3. at least 6 months but less than 1 year ❑ 9. unknown

111–112 BLANK

E. HEALTH STATUS

29. Have you **ever** been hospitalized for: (check one box for each question)
1. treatment of alcoholism?...... ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes **(113)**
2. treatment of drug problems?...... ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes
3. a psychiatric problem (include PTSD)?...... ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes **(115)**

116 BLANK

31. Which of the following health problems do you currently have: (check one box for each question)

    1. medical problem? . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes **(117)**

    2. problem with alcohol? . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

    3. problem with drugs? . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

    4. psychiatric or emotional problem? . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

32. Have you ever lost a job because of alcohol and/or drug problems? . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes **(121)**

F. LEGAL HISTORY

33. Have you ever been arrested? (check one) **(122)**

    ☐ 0. no   ☐ 2. yes, 2–5 times   ☐ 4. yes, more than 10 times

    ☐ 1. yes, once   ☐ 3. yes, 6–10 times

34. Have you ever been incarcerated (i.e. been in jail or prison) in your life? (check one) **(123)**

    ☐ 0. no   ☐ 1. yes, less than two weeks   ☐ 2. yes, two weeks or more

PART II CLINICIAN'S OBSERVATIONS AND IMPRESSIONS
(to be completed by a clinician)

35. How was contact with the VI (or CWT) Program initiated? (select one) **(124)**

    ☐ 1. referral from VA inpatient unit   ☐ 4. referral from a non-VA health

    ☐ 2. referral from a VA outpatient program   care provider/agency

         (specify outpt program type _____)   ☐ 5. self-referred

    ☐ 3. referral from a VA domiciliary   ☐ 6. Vet Center referral

                                     ☐ 7. other (specify _____)

                                 DO NOT CODE   ☐☐ **(126)**

36. Is the veteran currently in a VA domiciliary or inpatient unit? . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes **(127)**

**128–141
BLANK**

40. Please indicate below the veteran's DSM-III-R diagnosis as determined by professionals
    in this program or from the medical record. (check one box for each question)

    1. PTSD . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes **(142)**

    2. Anxiety Disorder (other than PTSD) . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

    3. Affective Disorder (other than Bipolar Disorder) . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

    4. Bipolar Disorder . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes **(145)**

    5. Schizophrenia . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

    6. Psychosis (other than schizophrenia) . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

    7. Adjustment Disorder . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes **(148)**

    8. Alcohol Abuse/Dependence . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

    9. Drug Abuse/Dependence . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

    10. Personality Disorder . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

    11. Other (specify _____) ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes **(152)**

41. Please indicate below any disabling medical conditions that apply to this veteran as
    determined by professionals in this program or from the medical record. (check one box
    for each question)

    1. Head Injury . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes **(153)**

    2. Cerebro-Vascular Accident (e.g. Stroke) . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

    3. Spinal Cord Injury (Paraplegia/Quadriplegia) . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

    4. Arthritis . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

    5. Multiple Sclerosis . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes **(157)**

    6. Liver Disease (e.g. Cirrhosis) . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

    7. Pulmonary Disease (e.g. COPD) . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

    8. Dementia . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

    9. Orthopedic Problems (e.g. Back Injuries) . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

    10. Other (specify _____) ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes **(162)**

                                  DO NOT CODE   ☐☐ **(164)**

For office
use only

COMPLETE THIS SECTION AT DISCHARGE

**165–170
BLANK**

Staff Member's Name _____

Last date worked in VI (or CWT) (mm,dd,yy) . . . . ☐☐/☐☐/☐☐ **(176)**

I. PARTICIPATION IN VETERANS INDUSTRIES

1. Hours worked in VI (or CWT):

   1. Total hours worked . . . . (hrs) ☐☐☐,☐☐☐ **(182)**

**183–185
BLANK**

2. Earnings in VI (or CWT):

   1. Total gross earnings (dollar amount — no cents) . . . . $ ☐☐,☐☐☐ **(190)**

**191–194
BLANK**

3. While in VI (or CWT), did the veteran spend any time in the following job locations?
   (check one box for each question)

   1. Workshop on VA grounds . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes **(195)**

   2. Supported employment (transitional work experience) on VA grounds . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

   3. Workshop in the community . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes

   4. Supported employment (transitional work experience) in the community . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes **(198)**

4. Consider the following work performance and clinical areas and select the description that best
   reflects changes that occurred during the veteran's VI (or CWT) admission (check one box for each question).

	9. not applicable	0. deteriorated	1. unchanged	2. improved	
A. Work Performance Areas					
1. Personal hygiene/appearance	☐	☐	☐	☐	**(199)**
2. Attendance and punctuality	☐	☐	☐	☐	
3. Acceptance of supervision	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4. Ability to get along with co-workers	☐	☐	☐	☐	
5. Productivity (output volume)	☐	☐	☐	☐	
6. Quality of production	☐	☐	☐	☐	**(204)**
B. Clinical Areas					
7. Alcohol problems	☐	☐	☐	☐	**(205)**
8. Drug problems	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9. Mental health problems other than substance abuse .	☐	☐	☐	☐	
10. Medical problems	☐	☐	☐	☐	**(208)**

5. In your opinion, is this veteran ready for working in full-time competitive employment?. . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes **(209)**

For office use only

II. DISCHARGE STATUS

6. The veteran's mode of discharge was: (check only one) **(210)**
   - ☐ 1. Mutually agreed upon planned discharge
   - ☐ 2. Involuntary discharge because of failure to comply with program requirements
     (specify _____)
   - ☐ 3. Veteran left the program before planned discharge date and informed staff of his/her departure
   - ☐ 4. Veteran left the program before planned discharge date and **did not** inform staff (AWOL)
   - ☐ 5. Veteran became ill (physically or mentally) and was not able to work in VI (or CWT)
   - ☐ 6. Other (specify _____)

   DO NOT CODE ☐☐ **(212)**

7. Veteran's employment situation after discharge from VI (or CWT) will be: (check only one) **(213)**
   - ☐ 1. Full-time paid competitive employment in the community
   - ☐ 2. Part-time paid competitive employment in the community
   - ☐ 3. VA's Incentive Therapy (IT)
   - ☐ 4. Student/trainee
   - ☐ 5. Unpaid volunteer
   - ☐ 6. Unemployed
   - ☐ 7. Retired/disabled/too ill
   - ☐ 8. Veteran left program without giving indication of his/her employment situation
   - ☐ 9. Other (specify _____)

   DO NOT CODE ☐☐ **(215)**

   216–221 BLANK

10. Veteran's housing situation after discharge from VI (or CWT) will be: (check only one) **(222)**
    - ☐ 1. Institution (e.g. hospital, nursing home, domicilary)
    - ☐ 2. Halfway house/transitional living program
    - ☐ 3. Own apartment, room or house (include boarding home)
    - ☐ 4. Apartment, room or house of friend or family member
    - ☐ 5. No available residence other than homeless shelters, outdoors etc.
    - ☐ 6. Veteran left program without giving indication of his/her housing situation
    - ☐ 7. Other (specify _____)

    DO NOT CODE ☐☐ **(224)**

III. ARRANGEMENTS FOR POST DISCHARGE AFTERCARE

11. If the veteran has arrangements to work in competitive employment after discharge,
    are there plans for VI (or CWT) staff to provide any of the following types of support?
    (check one box for each question)

	0. no	3. yes, weekly	2. yes, monthly	1. yes, less often than monthly	
a. office-based vocational counseling	☐	☐	☐	☐	**(225)**
b. on-the-job support	☐	☐	☐	☐	**(226)**
c. telephone support	☐	☐	☐	☐	**(227)**

Appendix B: CWT Monitoring Data Tables

List of Tables for FY05

List of Tables for FY05 (cont.)

List of Tables for FY05 (cont.)

Table 1. CWT/VI Discharges Documented by Monitoring Data by Site and by Fiscal Year †

VISN		SITE	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY93-FY05
1	402	Togus, ME													2	2
1	405	White River Jct, VT					7	10	1	0	2	9	18	25	27	99
1	518	Bedford, MA	64	385	482	508	539	486	482	348	365	262	290	256	258	4725
1	523	Boston, MA		15	4	0	0	0	0	30	51	27	26	35	25	213
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	2	56	124	73	80	154	126	65	87	67	86	119	119	1158
1	608	Manchester, NH ††			21	18	22	10								71
1	631	Northampton, MA	3	35	72	143	123	144	214	231	176	150	113	108	126	1638
1	650	Providence, RI	2	7	24	49	65	59	35	33	43	48	52	73	79	569
1	689	West Haven, CT		37	69	60	92	69	39	90	87	95	105	85	24	852
2	528	Buffalo, NY		2	41	58	72	77	70	43	54	42	71	76	100	706
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	4	24	11	26	1	46	77	38	24	34	54	48	31	418
2	528A6	Bath, NY		17	23	31	46	17	39	67	109	116	66	69	73	673
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	4	25	32	51	40	47	43	64	64	67	46	54	47	584
2	528A8	Albany, NY	11	40	23	69	35	62	43	120	113	112	117	113	91	949
3	526	Bronx, NY				11	50	67	77	94	115	121	139	120	126	920
3	561	E. Orange, NJ			5	26	166	203	221	159	21	24	20	15	36	896
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	20	109	94	226	121	57	0†	3	132	158	156	270	190	1536
3	620	Montrose, NY			2	37	108	201	182	174	141	75	139	121	131	1311
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY				6	55	62	45	49	67	57	57	78	71	547
3	632	Northport, NY	2	8	30	66	117	155	81	33	97	63	54	29	80	815
4	529	Butler, PA				8	6	24	49	49	45	54	27	50	45	357
4	542	Coatesville, PA	43	211	194	282	229	252	289	265	261	259	299	289	277	3150
4	595	Lebanon, PA		50	85	96	90	105	102	100	94	85	93	75	72	1047
4	642	Philadelphia, PA †††		1	2	3	29	14	67	46	22	20				204
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	9	58	105	157	172	210	153	168	170	182	197	124	134	1839
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA									2	31	28	10	0	71
5	512	Baltimore, MD				8	58	41	27	21	12	48	34	31	49	329
5	512A4	Ft. Howard, MD ††			1	5	10	10	24	15						65
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	5	0	10	26	24	23	33	13	41	142	157	111	39	624
5	613	Martinsburg, WV					26	0	217	205	223	212	149	178	111	1321
5	688	Washington, DC	4	16	58	52	57	75	40	93	82	123	118	90	92	900
6	558	Durham, NC††	0	4	17	19	22	18	19	12	10	2	0			123
6	590	Hampton, VA	20	124	116	118	113	124	72	75	86	75	91	55	64	1133
6	637	Asheville, NC		1	6	4	0	0	9	17	24	16	17	21	24	139
6	652	Richmond, VA		6	71	41	42	24	31	2	2	11	17	22	19	288
6	658	Salem, VA	4	29	34	27	52	25	68	42	38	39	77	72	73	580
6	659	Salisbury, NC††										7	0			7

Table 1 cont. CWT/VI Discharges Documented by Monitoring Data by Site and by Fiscal Year †

VISN		SITE	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY93-FY05
7	508	Atlanta, GA		13	228	170	112	139	179	307	195	119	114	173	136	1885
7	509	Augusta, GA	4	19	11	30	44	54	60	31	50	42	49	96	88	578
7	521	Birmingham, AL						2	59	68	56	62	53	23	0	323
7	534	Charleston, SC	5	20	51	47	36	52	64	59	80	80	59	49	33	635
7	544	Columbia, SC									1	60	49	103	186	399
7	557	Dublin, GA							4	15	0	20	33	30	52	154
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL									21	37	66	69	138	331
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	17	86	69	72	61	88	82	76	72	51	98	152	127	1051
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	2	20	67	71	73	132	165	165	135	103	81	82	82	1178
8	546	Miami, FL			15	20	20	30	44	56	39	47	52	40	0	363
8	548	W. Palm Beach, FL							19	25	35	38	59	47	85	308
8	573	Gainesville, FL			2	9	42	79	85	75	62	63	68	62	58	605
8	573A4	Lake City, FL ††				1	1	14								16
8	673OR	Orlando, FL											2	64	63	129
8	673	Tampa, FL	1	43	64	66	59	57	87	120	99	76	94	117	111	994
9	596	Lexington, KY ††††	22	104	101	87	74	62	50	51				3	19	573
9	603	Louisville, KY													15	15
9	614	Memphis, TN			1	4	32	25	33	39	37	31	37	32	49	320
9	621	Mt. Home, TN	5	2	104	88	127	143	139	106	126	86	97	86	93	1202
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	15	82	106	101	122	126	143	156	130	75	54	67	48	1225
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	11	116	4	54	87	92	68	85	122	120	143	205	157	1264
10	539	Cincinnati, OH									152	112	170	143	169	746
10	541	Cleveland, OH	5	85	125	109	120	154	132	145	164	143	99	142	193	1616
10	552	Dayton, OH			1	11	13	9	41	21	9	16	17	9	25	172
10	757	Columbus, OH												1	4	5
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI						5	6	3	14	24	14	28	37	131
11	515	Battle Creek, MI		18	78	127	101	83	86	61	57	57	45	53	52	818
11	550	Danville, IL	9	13	25	69	1	0	34	34	50	43	31	34	32	375
11	583	Indianapolis, IN					16	46	45	39	31	54	65	46	46	388
12	556	North Chicago, IL	16	69	55	76	0	0	111	211	205	165	181	167	166	1422
12	578	Hines, IL		51	52	97	121	140	128	160	182	146	91	81	25	1274
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI††									7	1	0		0	8
12	607	Madison, WI										2	17	20	32	71
12	676	Tomah, WI		17	48	65	51	33	53	50	77	41	47	70	65	617
12	695	Milwaukee, WI		17	72	55	53	66	86	82	69	56	60	51	38	705

Table 1 cont. CWT/VI Discharges Documented by Monitoring Data by Site and by Fiscal Year †

VISN		SITE	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY93-FY05
15	589	Kansas City, MO	4	96	189	159	105	118	129	110	0	7	91	67	87	1162
15	589A4	Columbia, MO			6	9	12	0	15	5	4	0	4	14	0	69
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	1	55	34	84	64	38	23	7	83	27	27	31	29	503
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	3	5	9	2	1	9	45	61	3	48	41	58	48	333
15	657	St. Louis, MO										1	1	1	0	3
15	657A4	Poplar Bluff, MO				9	11	11	5	6	1	7	2	3	3	58
16	520	Biloxi, MS		6	16	54	114	112	122	159	129	131	182	168	124	1317
16	580	Houston, TX	2	20	52	81	113	87	114	132	135	146	186	184	222	1474
16	586	Jackson, MS				1	11	21	25	44	50	15	41	38	54	300
16	598	Little Rock, AR		26	4	22	169	186	205	250	260	212	134	128	125	1721
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK		22	32	29	81	48	16	51	46	58	41	78	59	561
17	549	Dallas, TX	43	152	231	293	344	278	286	327	224	187	161	160	91	2777
17	549A4	Bonham, TX			17	2	36	39	83	65	65	47	35	39	45	473
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX									70	61	111	123	124	489
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX									122	198	223	263	325	1131
17	671	San Antonio, TX			6	18	28	30	19	25	23	24	51	36	41	301
17	674	Temple, TX		9	19	45	82	45	33	39	23	116	257	303	207	1178
17	674A4	Waco, TX ††	13	61	76	13	5	41	0	2	23	7				241
18	501	Albuquerque, NM								2	19	59	94	97	54	325
18	644	Phoenix, AZ ††					15	56	21	23	52					167
18	649	Prescott, AZ	7	14	28	29	76	72	87	86	122	63	56	98	83	821
18	678	Tucson, AZ			16	41	51	67	51	62	52	59	56	57	52	564
18	756	El Paso, TX					2	2	4	2	3	4	3	7	4	31
19	554GE	Colorado Springs, CO										7	11	3	4	25
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	1	14	29	16	24	23	18	23	30	24	21	22	31	276
19	666	Sheridan, WY							12	11	11	4	0	11	3	16	68
20	463	Anchorage, AK		14	17	45	75	40	21	24	34	32	27	25	48	402
20	648	Portland, OR			21	34	19	29	45	80	88	76	88	81	72	633
20	653	Roseburg, OR		9	18	15	22	14	30	32	41	9	10	1	0	201
20	663	Seattle, WA ††			5	12	20	14	3	6	0	0				60
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	5	29	139	89	113	69	68	56	35	50	89	72	115	929
20	687	Walla Walla, WA										11	12	11	0	34
20	692	White City, OR	3	44	44	115	147	147	168	87	85	92	122	151	171	1376
21	459	Honolulu, HI		2	6	8	8	9	9	18	10	16	10	21	12	129
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	45	191	59	1	10	52	36	42	47	66	68	75	80	772
21	654	Reno, NV		1	3	5	1	12	9	12	12	9	15	12	14	105
21	662	San Francisco, CA	8	49	62	86	79	98	88	44	96	99	70	51	63	893

Table 1 cont. CWT/VI Discharges Documented by Monitoring Data by Site and by Fiscal Year †

VISN		SITE	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY93-FY05
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**		6	4	46	35	59	60	55	23	42	31	30	30	421
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**		3	44	76	69	73	84	78	89	85	73	77	92	843
22	664	**San Diego, CA**					3	10	21	23	24	45	63	68	23	280
22	691	**West LA, CA†††††**				10	22	0	22	46	5	17	29	11	6	168
22	691A4	Sepulveda, CA	10	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
23	437	**Fargo, ND**											2	9	16	27
23	438	**Sioux Falls, SD ††**									15	10				25
23	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	3	37	88	82	91	66	58	54	51	57	34	32	40	693
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	15	70	96	86	98	66	83	75	83	64	81	76	118	1011
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**								15	12	42	38	63	56	226
23	636	**Omaha, NE**												7	18	25
23	636A6	**Des Moines, ††**						4	18	27	7	1	0			57
23	636A7	**Knoxville, IA††**	3	29	52	103	44	92	71	45	19	29	12			499
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	10	62	109	172	178	223	221	181	100	118	256	272	223	2125
TOTAL			**485**	**3,081**	**4,567**	**5,625**	**6,413**	**6,874**	**7,405**	**7,496**	**7,556**	**7,281**	**7,928**	**8,293**	**8,084**	**81,088**
SITE AVERAGE			**11**	**45**	**56**	**63**	**67**	**69**	**75**	**73**	**70**	**65**	**72**	**77**	**73**	**659**
SITE S.D.			**13**	**60**	**69**	**74**	**74**	**74**	**76**	**73**	**67**	**58**	**64**	**68**	**65**	**687**

† Due to missing data, fifty-two veterans could not be assigned a fiscal year and two veterans could not be assigned a site.

†† Site has either closed or undergone consolidation.

††† Site was re-opened in FY05 but had no discharges.

†††† Site was closed from FY01 to FY03 and reopened during FY04.

††††† Discharges for West LA are only included in this table since forms were received too late for inclusion.

Table 2. Sociodemographic Characteristics, Service Era and Referral Source at Admission by Fiscal Year

VETERAN CHARACTERISTICS	FY93 n=485	FY94 n=3,081	FY95 n=4,567	FY96 n=5,625	FY97 n=6,413	FY98 n=6,875	FY99 n=7,405	FY00 n=7,496	FY01 n=7,556	FY02 n=7,282	FY03 n=7,924	FY04 n=8,224	FY05 n=8,078
SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC													
Age (mean years)	43.1	43.0	42.2	43.8	44.4	44.9	45.4	46.0	46.6	47.0	47.4	47.6	48.1
Female	3.1%	3.2%	3.4%	4.1%	4.0%	4.5%	4.5%	4.3%	4.1%	4.0%	4.5%	4.2%	4.9%
Ethnicity													
White	57.1%	55.1%	50.2%	49.5%	50.4%	49.2%	47.0%	44.5%	46.0%	42.8%	42.7%	42.7%	42.9%
African American	36.0%	39.1%	43.7%	43.2%	41.7%	43.3%	45.9%	48.3%	46.5%	49.7%	50.2%	49.9%	50.5%
Hispanic	4.4%	3.5%	2.4%	3.6%	4.4%	4.4%	4.8%	4.6%	4.5%	4.8%	4.7%	4.9%	3.9%
Other	2.5%	2.3%	3.7%	3.7%	3.5%	3.1%	2.3%	2.6%	3.1%	2.7%	2.4%	2.5%	2.7%
Marital status													
married	10.7%	9.6%	9.1%	9.3%	9.3%	8.9%	7.8%	7.6%	7.9%	7.6%	8.1%	8.2%	8.2%
separated/widowed/divorced	58.8%	61.1%	62.1%	61.0%	61.7%	63.0%	63.2%	63.3%	63.7%	64.5%	62.7%	63.3%	63.3%
never married	31.6%	29.3%	28.9%	29.7%	29.1%	28.1%	29.0%	29.2%	28.5%	27.9%	29.2%	28.5%	28.6%
Education													
< 12 years	14.2%	12.1%	10.2%	10.0%	11.4%	10.1%	9.8%	8.8%	7.6%	7.8%	7.3%	7.3%	6.6%
12 years	47.4%	50.5%	50.8%	49.9%	49.5%	49.5%	49.6%	50.0%	50.7%	51.8%	50.7%	52.3%	52.8%
> 12 years	38.4%	37.5%	39.1%	40.1%	39.1%	40.5%	40.7%	41.3%	41.7%	40.4%	42.0%	40.4%	40.6%
SERVICE ERA													
Persian Gulf era	1.7%	2.3%	2.7%	3.1%	3.0%	4.0%	4.4%	4.6%	5.0%	5.9%	6.3%	7.8%	8.4%
Post-Vietnam era	26.5%	29.7%	32.5%	34.4%	35.1%	35.7%	37.7%	40.2%	40.9%	43.2%	47.0%	48.8%	51.4%
Vietnam era	56.5%	54.8%	53.7%	51.9%	52.8%	52.4%	50.8%	48.8%	48.8%	46.3%	43.2%	40.7%	38.2%
Between Korean and Vietnam eras	8.1%	8.8%	7.7%	7.7%	6.7%	6.3%	5.8%	5.2%	4.4%	4.0%	3.0%	2.3%	1.7%
Korean era	4.1%	2.9%	2.2%	2.0%	1.9%	1.3%	0.9%	1.0%	0.8%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%
All other service eras	3.1%	1.5%	1.2%	0.9%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%
REFERRAL SOURCE													
VA inpatient unit	33.5%	32.6%	27.6%	24.7%	17.9%	13.9%	13.3%	11.6%	11.0%	11.4%	10.2%	8.5%	6.3%
VA outpatient program	25.1%	24.7%	27.3%	30.7%	36.1%	38.5%	38.2%	40.5%	40.4%	40.5%	40.5%	40.3%	42.4%
VA domiciliary	26.2%	26.1%	26.6%	28.5%	31.0%	33.1%	34.4%	32.3%	33.7%	33.4%	33.2%	32.9%	32.5%
Non-VA health care provider or agency	1.3%	2.7%	2.4%	1.8%	1.7%	2.2%	2.7%	3.5%	3.8%	2.9%	2.6%	3.3%	2.2%
Self-referred	4.6%	6.9%	10.1%	9.7%	8.4%	7.6%	7.4%	7.8%	7.7%	7.6%	9.0%	10.4%	11.6%
Vet Center	2.1%	1.1%	1.5%	1.1%	1.4%	1.0%	0.9%	1.1%	0.8%	1.0%	1.1%	0.9%	0.9%
Other	7.3%	5.9%	4.6%	3.5%	3.7%	3.8%	3.2%	3.3%	2.7%	3.2%	3.2%	3.8%	4.2%

Table 3. Employment, Income and Residential History at Admission by Fiscal Year

VETERAN CHARACTERISTICS	FY93 n=485	FY94 n=3,081	FY95 n=4,567	FY96 n=5,625	FY97 n=6,413	FY98 n=6,875	FY99 n=7,405	FY00 n=7,496	FY01 n=7,556	FY02 n=7,282	FY03 n=7,924	FY04 n=8,224	FY05 n=8,078
EMPLOYMENT HISTORY													
Worked previously in CWT	33.1%	27.6%	24.1%	26.8%	26.1%	27.7%	27.7%	29.5%	31.1%	31.6%	31.4%	33.5%	33.5%
Usual employment pattern past 3 years													
Competitively employed full-time	31.1%	36.1%	37.5%	38.7%	40.1%	40.6%	42.5%	43.3%	44.1%	42.4%	43.0%	41.9%	41.3%
Competitively emp regular part-time	7.1%	7.3%	9.6%	8.7%	8.4%	7.9%	8.5%	8.4%	8.3%	8.9%	3.4%	9.1%	8.9%
Competitively emp irregular part-time	21.7%	20.5%	20.7%	19.3%	19.5%	20.6%	20.7%	20.4%	21.0%	22.5%	22.9%	22.6%	22.7%
Student/trainee	0.9%	0.9%	0.8%	1.0%	0.8%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	0.6%	0.7%	0.5%	0.8%	0.6%
Unpaid volunteer	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%
Retired/disabled	10.5%	9.7%	7.8%	8.3%	7.9%	7.2%	6.0%	6.9%	6.5%	5.6%	5.4%	5.6%	5.0%
Unemployed	26.2%	23.0%	21.1%	21.2%	20.8%	20.2%	18.6%	17.6%	16.0%	16.6%	16.4%	16.5%	18.5%
Other	2.2%	2.2%	2.0%	2.5%	2.1%	2.4%	2.6%	2.4%	3.0%	3.0%	3.1%	3.2%	2.6%
Usually employed or involved in constructive activity past 3 years	61.2%	65.1%	69.1%	68.0%	69.2%	70.2%	72.9%	73.0%	74.4%	74.8%	75.1%	74.6%	73.9%
Days worked for pay past 30 days													
none	87.5%	89.5%	88.8%	88.1%	88.2%	88.3%	88.8%	89.5%	90.7%	90.7%	90.8%	91.4%	91.3%
1-19 days	8.6%	7.4%	7.4%	8.4%	8.6%	8.0%	8.1%	8.2%	6.8%	7.0%	7.2%	6.7%	6.7%
> 19 days	4.0%	3.1%	3.8%	3.6%	3.2%	3.8%	3.1%	2.3%	2.6%	2.3%	2.1%	2.0%	2.0%
Mean # of days worked for pay past 30	1.7	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0	0.9
Ever lost a job due to substance abuse	47.6%	52.9%	55.0%	55.4%	55.9%	55.9%	57.7%	58.5%	58.2%	57.7%	56.6%	57.8%	56.3%
INCOME HISTORY													
Public Financial Support													
SC psychiatry	10.2%	9.5%	6.7%	6.3%	6.1%	5.4%	5.3%	5.0%	4.8%	4.4%	4.1%	4.1%	4.3%
SC medical	14.9%	12.4%	11.8%	13.4%	13.4%	12.4%	12.9%	13.5%	12.2%	12.2%	11.9%	12.3%	13.3%
NSC pension	2.9%	3.9%	3.4%	3.6%	3.6%	3.0%	3.2%	4.8%	4.8%	4.3%	4.5%	5.0%	4.9%
Receives any VA benefits	25.6%	23.2%	20.3%	21.5%	21.3%	19.1%	19.8%	21.6%	20.2%	19.5%	19.2%	20.1%	21.0%
Social Security benefits (SSI, SSDI)	22.3%	16.1%	13.1%	15.2%	12.7%	9.1%	9.4%	9.4%	9.0%	8.2%	7.1%	7.3%	7.7%
Any disability (VA and/or SS)	38.1%	31.9%	27.4%	30.3%	28.3%	24.3%	24.8%	25.2%	23.8%	23.0%	21.4%	21.7%	22.9%
Mean employment income past 30 days	$51.68	$35.65	$46.36	$45.39	$42.02	$46.60	$45.75	$40.83	$38.78	$37.26	$39.08	$36.17	$34.62
Mean public support income past 30 days	$302.76	$238.02	$206.55	$231.16	$212.56	$196.80	$192.99	$190.69	$178.23	$173.98	$169.44	$188.71	$193.74
Total income received past 30 days	$346.80	$270.81	$250.31	$270.96	$246.49	$235.87	$231.47	$227.89	$216.74	$211.09	$208.46	$224.84	$228.36
RESIDENTIAL HISTORY													
Usual residence past 30 days													
Own apartment, room or house	25.6%	23.8%	20.6%	21.7%	20.8%	18.6%	17.5%	16.9%	17.5%	16.3%	16.8%	16.5%	16.5%
Apartment, room or house of family or friend	18.5%	15.8%	16.5%	15.6%	13.3%	14.9%	13.6%	14.8%	14.5%	15.8%	16.6%	16.9%	17.7%
Hospital or nursing home	11.0%	13.1%	13.4%	12.3%	10.7%	9.3%	9.8%	8.6%	6.7%	6.8%	6.2%	5.5%	4.6%
Domiciliary	19.7%	21.1%	22.4%	23.8%	26.8%	27.4%	27.8%	24.8%	27.3%	26.7%	25.0%	25.8%	24.8%
Halfway house, transitional living	5.8%	7.4%	8.3%	9.4%	10.6%	12.0%	14.0%	16.8%	14.3%	14.4%	14.0%	14.8%	14.9%
Hotel or SRO	3.1%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	1.1%	0.9%	1.1%	1.1%	1.3%	1.2%	1.1%	1.2%	1.0%
Shelter	10.8%	12.6%	13.2%	11.6%	12.6%	12.5%	12.0%	12.2%	13.1%	13.4%	14.4%	14.3%	14.9%
Outdoors, abandoned building etc.	3.9%	4.0%	3.9%	3.9%	3.5%	3.1%	3.4%	3.7%	3.6%	3.6%	4.5%	3.8%	4.0%
Other	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%	1.2%	0.9%	1.2%	1.7%	1.9%	1.3%	1.2%	1.6%
Homeless when last living in community	53.4%	56.8%	59.8%	58.2%	57.9%	59.0%	61.8%	60.8%	60.4%	61.7%	62.4%	63.9%	64.4%
Currently in Domiciliary or Inpatient Unit	55.3%	49.7%	40.5%	40.1%	38.3%	38.5%	39.3%	37.8%	40.4%	41.5%	41.6%	42.2%	40.6%

Table 4. Legal History, Health Status and Hospitalization History at Admission by Fiscal Year

VETERAN CHARACTERISTICS	FY93 n=485	FY94 n=3,081	FY95 n=4,567	FY96 n=5,625	FY97 n=6,413	FY98 n=6,875	FY99 n=7,405	FY00 n=7,496	FY01 n=7,556	FY02 n=7,282	FY03 n=7,924	FY04 n=8,224	FY05 n=8,078
LEGAL HISTORY													
Arrest History													
Never been arrested	24.5%	23.0%	21.8%	22.1%	21.9%	21.8%	20.4%	19.0%	19.8%	19.5%	18.3%	18.3%	18.1%
Arrested once	22.0%	19.6%	18.2%	18.2%	18.9%	18.0%	19.6%	18.5%	18.1%	16.7%	16.6%	16.3%	16.3%
Arrested 2-5 times	33.7%	35.3%	38.0%	38.5%	38.4%	40.7%	40.1%	40.8%	40.3%	42.3%	43.3%	42.9%	43.1%
Arrested 6-10 times	9.8%	10.4%	10.9%	10.7%	9.4%	9.3%	10.0%	10.1%	10.8%	10.7%	11.0%	11.2%	11.7%
Arrested more than 10 times	10.0%	11.8%	11.2%	10.4%	11.4%	10.2%	10.0%	11.6%	11.1%	11.0%	10.9%	11.3%	10.8%
Incarceration History													
Never incarcerated	38.7%	35.4%	33.9%	34.2%	32.5%	32.8%	31.9%	29.2%	30.8%	31.5%	29.9%	29.9%	28.5%
Incarcerated less than two weeks	22.6%	25.2%	24.2%	24.5%	24.8%	25.5%	22.6%	23.6%	21.6%	20.0%	19.3%	18.9%	19.3%
Incarcerated more than two weeks	38.7%	39.4%	41.8%	41.3%	42.7%	41.7%	45.5%	47.2%	47.6%	48.6%	50.8%	51.2%	52.3%
CLINICAL ASSESSMENTS													
Psychiatric Diagnoses													
Alcohol abuse/dependency	62.7%	69.3%	72.2%	72.2%	73.6%	74.7%	74.3%	74.6%	75.3%	74.5%	73.4%	73.3%	73.3%
Drug abuse/dependency	43.7%	50.6%	54.4%	55.1%	55.5%	57.7%	59.7%	61.6%	60.2%	62.5%	62.4%	63.1%	64.4%
Any substance abuse/dependency	72.6%	78.8%	82.3%	82.5%	84.3%	85.6%	85.5%	86.5%	86.8%	86.6%	86.0%	86.6%	86.6%
Serious mental illness †	46.5%	43.3%	40.9%	43.1%	43.0%	43.3%	45.7%	45.1%	36.0%	39.9%	47.9%	51.2%	53.4%
Dual diagnosis ††	25.7%	29.5%	29.3%	31.1%	32.6%	34.3%	36.4%	36.3%	28.5%	31.9%	38.9%	42.1%	44.2%
Any psychiatric disorder	94.8%	95.4%	95.6%	96.4%	96.5%	96.7%	96.9%	97.1%	96.6%	97.2%	97.0%	97.3%	97.4%
Any disabling medical condition	42.8%	44.8%	46.1%	45.2%	44.2%	45.6%	47.2%	48.7%	51.2%	53.0%	56.7%	58.1%	60.9%
Any psychiatric disorder or disabling medical condition	98.8%	98.6%	98.9%	99.2%	99.2%	99.5%	99.6%	99.6%	99.7%	99.7%	99.8%	99.7%	99.7%
HOSPITALIZATION HISTORY													
Ever hospitalized for alcohol problems	64.3%	70.4%	71.7%	71.2%	70.4%	70.8%	70.0%	69.2%	68.2%	65.4%	64.3%	63.9%	64.0%
Ever hospitalized for drug problems	42.5%	51.1%	53.9%	54.3%	52.8%	53.4%	55.3%	56.3%	54.0%	54.7%	54.2%	54.4%	54.8%
Ever hospitalized for psychiatric problems	50.8%	49.2%	43.3%	44.9%	42.9%	42.0%	42.9%	42.4%	41.1%	39.0%	37.8%	39.2%	41.2%
Ever hospitalized for any mental health problem†††	88.8%	91.6%	90.5%	89.7%	88.8%	87.8%	87.4%	86.6%	85.3%	83.4%	81.9%	81.9%	81.7%

† Serious mental illness is defined as having a psychiatric diagnosis that falls into one of the following categories: schizophrenia, other psychotic disorder, affective disorder, bipolar disorder, PTSD and other anxiety disorders.

†† Dual Diagnosis is defined as having both a substance abuse disorder and a serious psychiatric disorder.

††† Any mental health problem includes any alcohol, drug or psychiatric problem.

Table 5. Program Participation by Fiscal Year

VETERAN CHARACTERISTICS	FY93 n=485	FY94 n=3,080	FY95 n=4,562	FY96 n=5,625	FY97 n=6,412	FY98 n=6,875	FY99 n=7,405	FY00 n=7,496	FY01 n=7,554	FY02 n=7,285	FY03 n=7,851	FY04 n=8,224	FY05 n=8,078
TYPE OF DISCHARGE													
Mutually agreed upon/planned discharge	42.1%	41.4%	39.1%	43.1%	44.6%	46.9%	51.2%	51.3%	51.3%	53.1%	53.7%	54.2%	53.4%
Noncompliance with program requirements	9.2%	12.7%	14.0%	15.6%	16.0%	17.0%	16.1%	15.3%	17.3%	16.6%	15.9%	16.7%	16.8%
Left before planned dc (informed staff)	14.5%	14.0%	14.0%	12.1%	14.3%	13.9%	11.7%	12.3%	11.5%	11.8%	11.1%	10.2%	10.7%
Left before planned dc (did not inform staff)	23.8%	24.9%	26.7%	21.6%	19.0%	16.7%	15.9%	15.0%	14.4%	13.4%	14.2%	13.2%	13.3%
Veteran became too ill to participate	9.4%	5.6%	4.7%	5.4%	4.7%	4.4%	4.0%	4.2%	4.1%	4.0%	4.2%	4.7%	4.5%
Other	1.1%	1.4%	1.5%	2.2%	1.4%	1.1%	1.2%	1.9%	1.4%	1.1%	1.0%	1.0%	1.3%
HOURS/EARNINGS IN CWT/VI													
Total mean hours worked in CWT/VI	77.0	224.2	374.6	462.1	510.9	515.6	556.9	538.4	492.9	548.9	535.2	540.1	555.3
Mean hours worked per week	19.9	21.7	23.8	23.3	25.3	25.4	25.5	26.1	25.8	26.3	26.2	26.5	27.0
Mean weeks worked	3.9	10.0	15.5	19.0	19.6	19.9	21.7	21.2	19.0	20.7	19.9	20.0	21.2
Total mean earnings in CWT/VI	$307.94	$1,025.07	$1,835.60	$2,277.83	$2,573.87	$2,819.27	$3,235.00	$3,107.16	$2,896.83	$3,321.20	$3,216.65	$3,351.72	$3,522.88
Mean hourly wage	$3.82	$4.23	$4.59	$4.49	$4.88	$5.29	$5.51	$5.59	$5.73	$5.83	$5.93	$5.99	$6.07
Mean weekly earnings	$83.28	$99.02	$118.95	$113.49	$133.23	$142.29	$146.63	$155.60	$152.10	$159.80	$160.51	$159.44	$168.47
LOCATION OF PARTICIPATION													
Any Workshop Placement	84.1%	78.1%	68.0%	66.8%	58.2%	51.5%	42.3%	41.2%	37.4%	34.7%	32.0%	31.4%	29.2%
Workshop on VA Grounds	76.1%	73.4%	56.0%	56.0%	49.2%	43.2%	33.4%	30.2%	27.4%	27.2%	25.1%	25.0%	23.3%
Workshop in the Community	9.5%	63.6%	13.8%	12.6%	10.4%	10.4%	11.1%	12.4%	10.9%	8.9%	8.5%	8.4%	6.9%
Workshop placement only	67.2%	55.8%	40.4%	36.3%	29.7%	34.5%	19.1%	20.3%	20.4%	16.9%	17.8%	17.6%	16.2%
Any TWE Placement	30.1%	43.3%	58.8%	62.6%	69.7%	75.1%	80.5%	79.2%	78.7%	82.7%	81.8%	81.8%	82.9%
TWE on VA Grounds	15.1%	25.9%	46.4%	52.5%	58.4%	63.0%	67.4%	67.7%	66.6%	69.6%	68.8%	70.7%	70.6%
TWE in the Community	16.1%	20.1%	16.2%	14.7%	16.8%	17.6%	18.1%	16.5%	16.5%	18.2%	17.6%	15.5%	16.6%
TWE Only	14.2%	21.1%	31.3%	32.0%	41.2%	48.1%	57.2%	58.3%	61.7%	65.0%	67.6%	68.0%	69.9%

Table 6. Percent of Veterans Rated by Clinicians as Clinically Improved by Fiscal Year

VETERAN CHARACTERISTICS	FY93 n=485	FY94 n=3,081	FY95 n=4,567	FY96 n=5,625	FY97 n=6,413	FY98 n=6,875	FY99 n=7,405	FY00 n=7,496	FY01 n=7,556	FY02 n=7,282	FY03 n=7,924	FY04 n=8,224	FY05 n=8,078
IMPROVEMENT IN WORK PERFORMANCE AREAS†													
Personal hygiene/appearance	18.8%	23.9%	29.0%	34.2%	45.8%	55.9%	62.0%	66.2%	67.2%	70.5%	70.5%	71.8%	70.8%
Attendance and punctuality	22.0%	27.2%	31.5%	36.7%	48.4%	56.2%	61.0%	61.2%	63.8%	65.8%	66.5%	67.1%	65.7%
Acceptance of Supervision	23.7%	31.4%	34.6%	39.8%	49.6%	58.3%	62.9%	64.2%	66.4%	69.6%	70.1%	70.6%	69.0%
Relationship with co-workers	23.3%	32.9%	35.0%	40.1%	50.1%	57.6%	62.9%	64.7%	66.5%	69.4%	69.5%	70.7%	69.8%
Productivity	40.4%	41.7%	39.2%	44.6%	55.1%	62.1%	64.9%	66.4%	67.0%	69.6%	70.3%	70.1%	69.1%
Quality of production	35.4%	40.2%	38.9%	43.9%	54.0%	61.2%	64.9%	66.6%	67.7%	69.9%	70.7%	70.7%	69.9%
Average work improvement score ††	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.29	1.41	1.50	1.55	1.57	1.60	1.62	1.64	1.64	1.63
VETERAN IS READY FOR COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT	38.4%	42.7%	42.9%	45.9%	51.3%	54.8%	59.8%	60.3%	59.7%	61.6%	64.3%	64.6%	66.0%
IMPROVEMENT IN CLINICAL AREAS †													
Alcohol problems	26.3%	28.6%	31.8%	34.4%	45.5%	55.3%	61.2%	63.4%	63.8%	65.8%	65.8%	66.5%	67.1%
Drug problems	19.4%	25.0%	26.4%	31.0%	42.5%	53.7%	59.9%	62.9%	62.3%	64.6%	64.3%	65.5%	65.6%
Mental health problems	21.4%	22.1%	20.0%	22.7%	32.8%	41.1%	45.5%	47.1%	48.9%	51.5%	52.5%	54.5%	56.2%
Medical problems	10.6%	12.1%	14.2%	12.9%	23.7%	31.1%	34.9%	35.2%	39.6%	39.9%	39.2%	40.3%	43.1%
EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT DISCHARGE													
Competitively employed full-time	15.5%	17.1%	22.5%	24.3%	28.5%	32.4%	34.0%	36.5%	37.3%	34.9%	35.1%	36.8%	36.4%
Competitively employed part-time	5.8%	3.8%	2.9%	4.0%	4.6%	4.7%	4.9%	4.8%	3.9%	5.1%	4.8%	4.8%	4.2%
Incentive Therapy (IT)	2.1%	2.3%	2.8%	1.7%	1.4%	1.3%	1.5%	1.5%	1.3%	1.5%	1.6%	1.9%	1.7%
Student/trainee	2.9%	3.1%	2.6%	3.3%	3.2%	2.5%	3.1%	3.2%	2.8%	2.9%	2.9%	3.1%	3.6%
Unpaid volunteer	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.7%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%
Unemployed	20.3%	26.1%	27.8%	29.2%	29.5%	27.7%	27.6%	24.6%	25.8%	26.8%	27.5%	26.3%	26.5%
Retired/disabled	16.4%	13.6%	8.9%	10.9%	10.7%	10.2%	9.4%	10.5%	10.9%	10.4%	10.8%	11.1%	10.1%
Unknown	30.2%	28.1%	28.1%	23.3%	19.3%	18.8%	15.8%	14.8%	14.4%	13.4%	13.0%	11.9%	12.1%
Other	6.6%	5.8%	4.0%	3.0%	2.4%	2.1%	3.4%	3.9%	3.3%	4.4%	3.8%	3.7%	4.8%
HOUSING STATUS AT DISCHARGE													
Hospital, nursing home or domiciliary	26.8%	21.6%	16.3%	14.3%	13.4%	13.9%	13.1%	13.5%	13.1%	13.7%	12.9%	12.5%	12.6%
Halfway house/transitional living program	3.5%	5.0%	4.6%	6.7%	7.2%	8.5%	9.3%	10.9%	11.6%	13.4%	12.6%	13.5%	14.9%
Own apartment, room or house	23.5%	27.9%	29.6%	35.0%	37.2%	36.3%	38.8%	35.4%	33.7%	33.3%	35.0%	37.2%	36.0%
Apartment, room, house of family/friend	11.5%	12.0%	14.8%	13.5%	15.8%	16.8%	15.8%	16.8%	17.3%	17.9%	18.1%	16.4%	16.3%
No available residence/homeless	3.7%	2.8%	4.8%	5.9%	5.4%	4.7%	4.7%	5.2%	6.2%	5.8%	5.6%	4.8%	5.1%
Unknown	30.2%	29.9%	28.6%	23.1%	20.0%	18.6%	16.9%	16.8%	16.4%	14.3%	14.6%	14.1%	13.4%
Other	0.9%	1.0%	1.3%	1.5%	1.1%	1.2%	1.3%	1.5%	1.7%	1.5%	1.2%	1.5%	1.7%

† Improvement is noted for only those veterans with problems in that area.

†† Average Work Improvement score is the mean of five work performance areas, range 0-2 (0 = deteriorated, 1 = unchanged, and 2 = improved).

Table 7. Program Participation by VISN for FY05

			VETERAN CHARACTERISTIC	PROGRAM PARTICIPATION			
VISN †			Serious Mental Illness ††	Mutually Agreed/Planned Discharge	Failure to Comply with Program Requirements	Average Number of Hours Worked Per Week	Average Mean Hourly Wage in CWT/VI
VISN	**#SITES**	**N**	**%**	**%**	**%**	**%**	**$**
1	8	660	69.1%	48.5%	18.2%	**18.2**	7.50
2	5	342	54.5%	68.0%	13.8%	30.3	**5.22**
3	6	634	**43.0%**	67.6%	15.2%	32.3	6.09
4	4	528	45.8%	**42.8%**	9.3%	26.8	5.69
5	4	291	56.0%	62.9%	12.0%	30.6	5.53
6	4	180	**40.6%**	56.1%	**23.9%**	30.0	5.81
7	8	760	57.4%	54.3%	**21.6%**	32.2	5.71
8	6	399	**33.1%**	61.4%	10.8%	32.2	5.52
9	5	224	53.6%	49.6%	**21.9%**	29.9	5.43
10	5	548	47.1%	54.4%	18.1%	**22.2**	6.69
11	4	167	62.3%	47.3%	19.8%	26.9	6.22
12	6	326	51.8%	58.3%	18.4%	29.3	6.69
15	6	167	64.7%	52.1%	**22.2%**	31.4	6.04
16	5	584	50.0%	**44.9%**	17.8%	30.5	5.81
17	6	833	52.6%	**43.7%**	19.1%	**16.4**	**5.18**
18	4	193	57.5%	52.3%	15.0%	23.9	6.49
19	3	51	72.5%	47.1%	17.6%	25.5	5.96
20	6	406	67.7%	54.4%	17.0%	25.4	6.19
21	4	169	50.9%	53.3%	12.4%	27.9	8.50
22	5	145	50.3%	62.8%	10.3%	23.2	6.29
23	6	471	60.1%	51.8%	16.1%	33.1	6.49
VISN Avg			**54.3%**	**54.0%**	**16.7%**	**27.5**	**$6.14**
VISN S.D.			**9.8%**	**7.4%**	**4.1%**	**4.7**	**0.77**
VETERAN Avg			**53.4%**	**53.4%**	**16.8%**	**27.0**	**$6.07**

† Includes data on all veterans from all sites; no data was omitted due to small N's.

†† Serious mental illness is defined as having a psychiatric diagnosis that falls into one of the following categories: schizophrenia, other psychotic disorder, affective disorder, bipolar disorder, PTSD and other anxiety disorders.

Table 8a. Unadjusted Critical Outcome Monitor Measures by VISN for FY05

VISN †			AVERAGE WORK IMPROVEMENT	ALCOHOL PROBLEMS IMPROVED†† %	DRUG PROBLEMS IMPROVED†† %	MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS IMPROVED†† %	MEDICAL PROBLEMS IMPROVED†† %	COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED %	UNEMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE %	EMPLOYMENT STATUS UNKNOWN AT DISCHARGE %
VISN	#SITES	# VETS								
1	8	660	1.45	46.0%	47.3%	39.6%	26.5%	26.4%	40.4%	13.1%
2	5	342	1.49	67.8%	65.2%	56.5%	36.0%	40.2%	28.4%	5.6%
3	6	634	1.59	65.2%	64.4%	52.5%	40.8%	35.6%	21.0%	7.4%
4	4	528	1.78	91.8%	91.4%	78.8%	46.1%	40.7%	22.7%	23.3%
5	4	291	1.74	71.6%	69.2%	65.0%	49.8%	36.8%	25.1%	8.6%
6	4	180	1.79	69.5%	71.5%	53.2%	27.2%	42.8%	38.3%	4.4%
7	8	760	1.62	67.1%	67.1%	67.0%	55.1%	45.9%	24.1%	8.2%
8	6	399	1.76	84.3%	82.6%	68.9%	30.9%	62.7%	15.0%	12.5%
9	5	224	1.73	70.5%	70.5%	55.8%	55.2%	38.4%	29.5%	17.0%
10	5	548	1.85	82.2%	82.6%	73.8%	58.9%	44.2%	23.4%	10.2%
11	4	167	1.44	46.5%	38.8%	38.5%	25.6%	35.9%	33.5%	9.6%
12	6	326	1.77	82.4%	78.4%	63.9%	62.1%	53.1%	25.2%	2.8%
15	6	167	1.72	68.1%	66.2%	54.9%	58.6%	41.3%	17.4%	19.2%
16	5	584	1.57	68.2%	66.4%	53.3%	33.2%	42.6%	28.8%	11.0%
17	6	833	1.46	44.8%	42.7%	39.8%	34.5%	29.5%	34.8%	18.1%
18	4	193	1.63	78.0%	77.5%	60.3%	45.0%	39.4%	29.5%	14.5%
19	3	51	1.56	51.2%	39.3%	48.9%	16.7%	41.2%	13.7%	17.6%
20	6	406	1.57	66.8%	62.9%	58.0%	53.2%	50.0%	13.1%	12.3%
21	4	169	1.60	65.0%	62.6%	58.7%	50.4%	40.2%	34.3%	8.3%
22	5	145	1.87	84.9%	83.2%	77.1%	60.9%	46.2%	8.3%	7.6%
23	6	471	1.63	69.4%	64.4%	53.8%	42.6%	38.2%	28.5%	16.1%
VISN Average			**1.65**	**68.6%**	**66.4%**	**58.0%**	**43.3%**	**41.5%**	**25.5%**	**11.8%**
VISN SD			**0.13**	**13.1%**	**14.5%**	**11.4%**	**13.4%**	**7.7%**	**8.6%**	**5.3%**
Veteran Average			**1.63**	**67.1%**	**65.6%**	**56.2%**	**43.0%**	**40.6%**	**26.5%**	**12.1%**

† Includes data on all veterans from all sites; no data was omitted due to small N's.

†† Only veterans with a problem in this area were included.

Table 8b. Percent and Direction From Median Performance of VISN: Critical Outcome Monitor Measures for FY05 †

				ALCOHOL	DRUG	MENTAL HEALTH	MEDICAL			EMPLOYMENT
VISN Median Value			1.62	67.8%	77.5%	60.3%	42.6%	38.2%	25.2%	11.0%
Veteran Average			1.63	67.1%	65.6%	56.2%	43.0%	40.6%	26.5%	12.1%

	VISN††		AVERAGE WORK IMPROVEMENT	ALCOHOL PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	DRUG PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	MEDICAL PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED %	UNEMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE %	EMPLOYMENT STATUS UNKNOWN %
VISN	#SITES	# VETS								
1	8	660	-0.13	-20.2%	-18.1%	-15.3%	-13.9%	-7.2%	14.4%	2.1%
2	5	342	-0.15	0.0%	-2.3%	-1.1%	-8.8%	-0.9%	2.1%	-4.6%
3	6	634	-0.05	-0.6%	-3.4%	-9.0%	-8.0%	-5.4%	-5.0%	-3.6%
4	4	528	0.14	33.2%	34.1%	26.4%	3.9%	-1.1%	-3.1%	11.4%
5	4	291	0.12	0.6%	8.2%	13.5%	8.3%	-1.5%	-0.6%	-1.8%
6	4	180	0.14	-2.9%	3.7%	-1.4%	-27.7%	0.4%	13.2%	-7.2%
7	8	760	0.00	3.8%	5.6%	20.1%	13.6%	6.3%	-1.6%	-2.6%
8	6	399	0.09	19.6%	16.1%	12.9%	-17.6%	17.9%	-9.7%	1.4%
9	5	224	0.06	2.1%	3.1%	-4.6%	6.8%	-4.2%	4.7%	6.8%
10	5	548	0.22	21.9%	23.9%	26.8%	20.2%	3.2%	-2.0%	-1.0%
11	4	167	-0.16	-22.9%	-28.3%	-11.8%	-16.2%	-2.1%	7.4%	-1.9%
12	6	326	0.12	18.0%	12.3%	2.7%	14.9%	12.4%	0.0%	-7.7%
15	6	167	0.06	-9.0%	-9.6%	-2.9%	12.8%	0.3%	-9.5%	8.4%
16	5	584	-0.07	-4.9%	-5.0%	-4.8%	-14.0%	1.4%	3.1%	0.0%
17	6	833	-0.15	-16.3%	-27.5%	-17.5%	-6.3%	-10.0%	8.8%	6.2%
18	4	193	-0.04	6.2%	0.0%	0.0%	-11.4%	-2.2%	4.4%	4.7%
19	3	51	-0.04	-20.4%	-25.6%	-5.2%	-23.5%	3.0%	-11.7%	5.7%
20	6	406	-0.07	-2.1%	-2.8%	2.5%	8.0%	10.2%	-12.9%	2.1%
21	4	169	-0.01	-9.8%	-11.1%	1.9%	7.0%	3.8%	8.9%	-1.9%
22	5	145	0.29	23.1%	20.5%	23.1%	24.1%	12.2%	-16.7%	-2.7%
23	6	471	0.01	2.5%	1.5%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	5.2%

† Outcomes have been adjusted for the following veteran characteristics: Age, race, gender, previous employment history, residential history, receipt of disability benefits, history of psychiatric hospitalizations, and clinical psychiatric diagnoses; including serious psychiatric illness and substance abuse problems.

†† Includes data on all veterans from all sites; no data was omitted due to small N's.

††† Only veterans with a problem in this area were included.

Table 9. Summary of Outliers by VISN for FY05 †

VISN	Number of Sites in VISN ††	Number of Veterans in VISN †††	VETERAN CHARACTERISTICS	PROGRAM PARTICIPATION CRITICAL MONITORS	ADJUSTED OUTCOME MONITORS	TOTAL NUMBER OF OUTLIERS
1	8	660	0	1	7	8
2	5	342	0	1	1	2
3	6	634	1	0	0	1
4	4	528	0	1	1	2
5	4	291	0	0	0	0
6	4	180	1	1	2	4
7	8	760	0	1	0	1
8	6	399	1	0	1	2
9	5	224	0	1	1	2
10	5	548	0	1	0	1
11	4	167	0	0	4	4
12	6	326	0	0	0	0
15	6	167	0	1	1	2
16	5	584	0	1	2	3
17	6	833	0	3	7	10
18	4	193	0	0	0	0
19	3	51	0	0	1	1
20	6	406	0	0	1	1
21	4	169	0	0	1	1
22	5	145	0	0	0	0
23	6	471	0	0	1	1
TOTALS			**3**	**12**	**31**	**46**
VISN AVG			**0.1**	**0.6**	**1.5**	**2.2**
VISN SD			**0.3**	**0.7**	**2.0**	**2.5**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY05:
VISN 1, Togus; VISN 10; Columbus; VISN 15, Poplar Bluff; VISN 18, El Paso; and VISN 19, Colorado Springs.
†† Includes all sites for whom NEPEC received monitoring forms on veterans discharged during FY05.
††† Includes data on all veterans from all sites; no data was omitted due to small N's.

Table 10. Summary of Data Collection by Site for FY05

VISN	SITE		# of NEPEC Monitoring Forms for Veterans Discharged During FY05 N	VAHQ Annual Report of Discharges during FY05 N	Difference Between VAHQ Annual Report and NEPEC Monitoring Forms N	Percent of Discharges During FY05 for which Monitoring Data were Collected † %
1	405	**Togus**	2	6	-4	**33.3%**
1	405	**White River Junction**	27	28	-1	96.4%
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	258	231	27	111.7%
1	523	**Boston/Brockton, MA††**	144	132	12	109.1%
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	126	91	35	138.5%
1	650	**Providence, RI**	79	74	5	106.8%
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	24	117	-93	**20.5%**
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	100	98	2	102.0%
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	31	60	-29	51.7%
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	73	121	-48	60.3%
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	47	46	1	102.2%
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	91	92	-1	98.9%
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	126	128	-2	98.4%
3	561	**East Orange, NJ**	36	22	14	163.6%
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	190	200	-10	95.0%
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	131	130	1	100.8%
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	71	67	4	106.0%
3	632	**Northport, NY**	80	78	2	102.6%
4	529	**Butler, PA**	45	45	0	100.0%
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	277	445	-168	62.2%
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	72	74	-2	97.3%
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	134	144	-10	93.1%
4	693	**Wilkes-Barre, PA**	0	1	-1	**0.0%**
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	49	48	1	102.1%
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	39	73	-34	53.4%
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	111	104	7	106.7%
5	688	**Washington, DC**	92	102	-10	90.2%
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	64	91	-27	70.3%
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	24	22	2	109.1%
6	652	**Richmond, VA**	19	19	0	100.0%
6	658	**Salem, VA**	73	77	-4	94.8%
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	136	146	-10	93.2%
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	88	88	0	100.0%
7	521	**Birmingham, AL**	0	23	-23	**0.0%**
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	33	37	-4	89.2%
7	544	**Columbia, SC**	186	186	0	100.0%
7	557	**Dublin, GA**	52	64	-12	81.3%
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	138	165	-27	83.6%
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	127	122	5	104.1%
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	82	110	-28	74.5%
8	546	**Miami, FL**	0	56	-56	**0.0%**
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	85	56	29	151.8%
8	573	**Gainesville, FL**	58	55	3	105.5%
8	673	**Tampa/Orlando, FL**	174	164	10	106.1%
9	596	**Lexington, KY**	19	18	1	105.6%
9	603	**Louisville, KY**	15	49	-34	**30.6%**
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	49	50	-1	98.0%
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	93	91	2	102.2%
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	48	48	0	100.0%

Table 10 cont. Summary of Data Collection by Site for FY05

VISN		SITE	# of NEPEC Monitoring Forms for Veterans Discharged During FY05 N	VAHQ Annual Report of Discharges during FY05 N	Difference Between VAHQ Annual Report and NEPEC Monitoring Forms N	Percent of Discharges During FY05 for which Monitoring Data were Collected †, †† %
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	157	158	-1	99.4%
10	539	Cinninati, OH	169	176	-7	96.0%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	193	194	-1	99.5%
10	552	Dayton, OH	25	32	-7	78.1%
10	757	Columbus, OH	4	0		
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	37	50	-13	74.0%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	52	58	-6	89.7%
11	550	Danville, IL	32	47	-15	68.1%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	45	1	102.2%
11	610	Marion, IN	0	6	-6	0.0%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	166	167	-1	99.4%
12	578	Hines, IL	25	32	-7	78.1%
12	607	Madison, WI	32	32	0	100.0%
12	676	Tomah, WI	65	68	-3	95.6%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	38	39	-1	97.4%
15	589A4	Columbia, MO	0	15	-15	0.0%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	87	84	3	103.6%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	29	30	-1	96.7%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	48	50	-2	96.0%
15	657A4	Poplar Bluff, MO	3	3	0	100.0%
15	657	St.Louis, MO	0	30	-30	0.0%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	124	167	-43	74.3%
16	580	Houston, TX	222	240	-18	92.5%
16	586	Jackson, MS	54	50	4	108.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	125	124	1	100.8%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	59	95	-36	62.1%
17	549	Dallas/DallasDT, TX	416	496	-80	83.9%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	45	20	25	225.0%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	0		
17	671	San Antonio, TX	41	41	0	100.0%
17	674	Temple, TX	207	299	-92	69.2%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	54	80	-26	67.5%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	83	83	0	100.0%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	58	-6	89.7%
18	756	El Paso, TX	4	5	-1	80.0%
19	567GB	Colorado Springs, CO	4	39	-35	10.3%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	31	31	0	100.0%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	16	16	0	100.0%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	48	58	-10	82.8%
20	648	Portland, OR	72	68	4	105.9%
20	653	Roseburg/Eugene, OR ††	0	39	-39	0.0%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	115	123	-8	93.5%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	0	10	-10	0.0%
20	692	White City, OR	171	153	18	111.8%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	12	13	-1	92.3%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	80	76	4	105.3%
21	654	Reno, NV	14	12	2	116.7%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	63	61	2	103.3%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	29	1	103.4%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	92	91	1	101.1%
22	664	San Diego, CA	23	22	1	104.5%
22	691	West LA, CA	6	105	-105	5.7%
22	691A4	Sepulveda, CA	0	15	-15	0.0%

Table 10 cont. Summary of Data Collection by Site for FY05

VISN		SITE	# of NEPEC Monitoring Forms for Veterans Discharged During FY05 N	VAHQ Annual Report of Discharges during FY05 N	Difference Between VAHQ Annual Report and NEPEC Monitoring Forms N	Percent of Discharges During FY05 for which Monitoring Data were Collected †, †† %
23	437	**Fargo, ND**	16	27	-11	59.3%
23	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	40	3	37	1333.3%
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	118	118	0	100.0%
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	56	59	-3	94.9%
23	636	**Omaha, NE**	18	17	1	105.9%
23	636A7	**Knoxville, IA**	0	67	-67	**0.0%**
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	223	224	-1	99.6%
Total			**8,084**	**9,044**	**-960**	**89.4%**
Site Average			**74**	**83**	**-10**	**89.4%**
Site S.D.			**71**	**80**	**28**	**37.9%**

† A percentage greater than 100% indicates a site that reported more discharges to NEPEC than to VAHQ.

††Data from Boston and Brockton, Tampa and Orlando, and Dallas and Dallas (downtown) are combined.

Table 11. Mean Age and Gender by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Mean Age	GENERAL	
					% males	% females
1	405	White River Junction, VT	27	48.7	88.9%	11.1%
1	518	Bedford, MA	258	48.6	96.5%	3.5%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	49.0	88.0%	12.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	119	46.8	91.5%	8.5%
1	631	Northampton, MA	126	48.7	96.8%	3.2%
1	650	Providence, RI	79	49.6	92.4%	7.6%
1	689	West Haven, CT	24	51.5	100.0%	0.0%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	100	46.9	93.0%	7.0%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	31	47.6	93.5%	6.5%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	73	47.5	100.0%	0.0%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	47	46.0	93.6%	6.4%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	91	46.7	97.8%	2.2%
3	526	Bronx, NY	126	47.9	96.0%	4.0%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	36	47.4	97.2%	2.8%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	190	46.8	94.7%	5.3%
3	620	Montrose, NY	131	47.0	96.9%	3.1%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	71	49.9	91.5%	8.5%
3	632	Northport, NY	80	46.7	95.0%	5.0%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	45.7	100.0%	0.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	277	48.0	94.6%	5.4%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	72	47.5	98.6%	1.4%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	134	48.9	97.8%	2.2%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	49	49.3	95.9%	4.1%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	39	48.8	82.1%	17.9%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	111	49.7	97.3%	2.7%
5	688	Washington, DC	92	49.4	94.5%	5.5%
6	590	Hampton, VA	64	47.0	87.5%	12.5%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	50.5	91.7%	8.3%
6	652	Richmond, VA	19	51.9	78.9%	21.1%
6	658	Salem, VA	73	49.2	94.4%	5.6%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	136	47.6	93.4%	6.6%
7	509	Augusta, GA	88	49.4	84.1%	15.9%
7	534	Charleston, SC	33	47.7	100.0%	0.0%
7	544	Columbia, SC	186	48.8	94.1%	5.9%
7	557	Dublin, GA	52	48.0	98.1%	1.9%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	138	47.8	93.5%	6.5%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	127	48.3	93.7%	6.3%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	82	47.7	92.7%	7.3%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	85	47.4	97.6%	2.4%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	58	47.7	89.7%	10.3%
8	673	Tampa, FL	111	48.0	94.6%	5.4%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	63	47.8	96.8%	3.2%
9	596	Lexington, KY	19	46.5	94.7%	5.3%
9	603	Louisville, KY	15	48.7	100.0%	0.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	49	49.4	97.9%	2.1%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	93	48.0	97.8%	2.2%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	48	49.5	91.7%	8.3%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	157	47.1	96.8%	3.2%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	169	47.3	95.9%	4.1%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	193	47.0	90.2%	9.8%
10	552	Dayton, OH	25	48.3	88.0%	12.0%

Table 11 cont. Mean Age and Gender by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Mean Age	GENDER	
					% males	% females
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	37	51.8	94.6%	5.4%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	52	46.5	94.2%	5.8%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	32	48.7	100.0%	0.0%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	46	48.8	89.1%	10.9%
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	166	47.0	97.0%	3.0%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	25	49.9	96.0%	4.0%
12	607	**Madison, WI**	32	48.3	93.8%	6.3%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	65	48.4	100.0%	0.0%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	38	49.3	100.0%	0.0%
15	589	**Kansas City, MO**	87	48.3	96.6%	3.4%
15	589A5	**Topeka, KS**	29	49.3	96.6%	3.4%
15	589A6	**Leavenworth, KS**	48	48.6	93.8%	6.3%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	124	48.1	96.8%	3.2%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	222	50.3	96.8%	3.2%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	43	49.5	94.4%	5.6%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	125	44.6	95.2%	4.8%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	59	48.9	91.5%	8.5%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	91	47.0	93.4%	6.6%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	45	46.3	95.6%	4.4%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	124	49.4	94.4%	5.6%
17	549DT	**Dallas (downtown), TX**	325	48.8	95.7%	4.3%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	41	47.1	95.1%	4.9%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	207	46.9	95.2%	4.8%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	54	46.5	100.0%	0.0%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	83	49.1	96.4%	3.6%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	52	47.6	94.2%	5.8%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	31	48.2	96.8%	3.2%
19	666	**Sheridan, WY**	16	50.0	93.8%	6.3%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	48	47.8	93.8%	6.3%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	72	47.5	93.1%	6.9%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	115	46.6	92.2%	7.8%
20	692	**White City, OR**	171	49.2	97.7%	2.3%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	12	50.9	100.0%	0.0%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	80	48.0	97.5%	2.5%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	14	53.8	78.6%	21.4%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	63	48.4	95.2%	4.8%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	30	51.2	90.0%	10.0%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	92	47.9	98.9%	1.1%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	23	49.9	100.0%	0.0%
23	437	**Fargo, ND**	16	49.7	93.8%	6.3%
23	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	40	49.1	90.0%	10.0%
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	118	48.9	98.3%	1.7%
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	56	50.5	100.0%	0.0%
23	636	**Omaha, NE**	18	45.8	100.0%	0.0%
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	223	49.0	97.8%	2.2%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,078)				**48.1**	**95.1%**	**4.9%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=96)				**48.4**	**94.7%**	**5.3%**
SITE S.D.				**1.5**	**4.2%**	**4.2%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY05: VISN 1, Togus; VISN 10, Columbus; VISN 15, Poplar Bluff; VISN 18, El Paso; and VISN 19, Colorado Springs.

Table 12. Ethnicity by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	White %	African American %	Hispanic %	Other %
1	405	**White River Junction, VT**	27	92.6%	0.0%	3.7%	3.7%
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	258	78.7%	15.9%	1.9%	3.5%
1	523	**Boston, MA**	25	56.0%	44.0%	0.0%	0.0%
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	119	81.4%	16.9%	0.8%	0.8%
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	126	69.8%	26.2%	4.0%	0.0%
1	650	**Providence, RI**	79	74.7%	19.0%	2.5%	3.8%
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	24	45.8%	37.5%	12.5%	4.2%
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	100	37.4%	60.6%	1.0%	1.0%
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	31	45.2%	51.6%	0.0%	3.2%
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	73	42.5%	53.4%	4.1%	0.0%
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	47	51.1%	44.7%	2.1%	2.1%
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	91	38.5%	52.7%	4.4%	4.4%
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	126	3.2%	74.2%	19.4%	3.2%
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**	36	5.6%	91.7%	0.0%	2.8%
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	190	25.4%	66.1%	6.3%	2.1%
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	131	26.7%	61.8%	10.7%	0.8%
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	71	15.5%	80.3%	1.4%	2.8%
3	632	**Northport, NY**	80	50.0%	33.3%	9.0%	7.7%
4	529	**Butler, PA**	45	57.8%	40.0%	0.0%	2.2%
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	277	32.6%	62.3%	3.6%	1.4%
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	72	37.5%	61.1%	1.4%	0.0%
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	134	33.6%	64.2%	1.5%	0.7%
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	49	32.7%	65.3%	0.0%	2.0%
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	39	46.2%	51.3%	0.0%	2.6%
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	111	19.8%	73.0%	0.0%	7.2%
5	688	**Washington, DC**	92	8.8%	84.6%	2.2%	4.4%
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	64	20.3%	78.1%	1.6%	0.0%
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	24	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	652	**Richmond, VA**	19	26.3%	73.7%	0.0%	0.0%
6	658	**Salem, VA**	73	45.2%	53.4%	1.4%	0.0%
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	136	7.4%	91.2%	0.7%	0.7%
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	88	23.9%	73.9%	1.1%	1.1%
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	33	30.3%	66.7%	0.0%	3.0%
7	544	**Columbia, SC**	186	18.4%	79.5%	1.6%	0.5%
7	557	**Dublin, GA**	52	28.8%	71.2%	0.0%	0.0%
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	138	15.2%	80.4%	0.7%	3.6%
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	127	37.8%	58.3%	1.6%	2.4%
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	82	64.6%	34.1%	1.2%	0.0%
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	85	55.3%	35.3%	7.1%	2.4%
8	573	**Gainesville/Lake City, FL**	58	51.7%	41.4%	1.7%	5.2%
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	111	57.7%	36.0%	6.3%	0.0%
8	673OR	**Orlando, FL**	63	46.0%	49.2%	4.8%	0.0%
9	596	**Lexington, KY**	19	52.6%	47.4%	0.0%	0.0%
9	603	**Louisville, KY**	15	26.7%	73.3%	0.0%	0.0%
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	49	14.6%	83.3%	0.0%	2.1%
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	93	73.1%	25.8%	0.0%	1.1%
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	48	43.8%	56.3%	0.0%	0.0%
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	157	59.2%	34.4%	3.8%	2.5%
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	169	37.9%	60.9%	1.2%	0.0%
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	193	33.2%	65.3%	1.0%	0.5%
10	552	**Dayton, OH**	25	32.0%	60.0%	4.0%	4.0%
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	37	54.1%	29.7%	5.4%	10.8%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	52	50.0%	46.2%	3.8%	0.0%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	32	53.1%	40.6%	3.1%	3.1%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	46	47.8%	52.2%	0.0%	0.0%

Table 12 cont. Ethnicity by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	White %	African American %	Hispanic %	Other %
12	556	North Chicago, IL	166	27.7%	69.9%	1.8%	0.6%
12	578	Hines, IL	25	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%
12	607	Madison, WI	32	68.8%	31.3%	0.0%	0.0%
12	676	Tomah, WI	65	83.1%	12.3%	3.1%	1.5%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	38	28.9%	63.2%	7.9%	0.0%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	87	34.1%	63.5%	1.2%	1.2%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	29	62.1%	20.7%	0.0%	17.2%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	48	50.0%	45.8%	4.2%	0.0%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	124	45.2%	50.8%	4.0%	0.0%
16	580	Houston, TX	222	28.8%	65.3%	5.4%	0.5%
16	586	Jackson, MS	43	35.2%	64.8%	0.0%	0.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	125	37.6%	60.0%	1.6%	0.8%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	59	28.8%	61.0%	8.5%	1.7%
17	549	Dallas, TX	91	14.3%	82.4%	1.1%	2.2%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	45	42.2%	53.3%	4.4%	0.0%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	37.1%	58.1%	3.2%	1.6%
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX	325	20.0%	75.7%	2.5%	1.8%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	41	56.1%	14.6%	29.3%	0.0%
17	674	Temple, TX	207	55.1%	32.9%	10.6%	1.4%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	54	41.5%	24.5%	20.8%	13.2%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	83	72.3%	15.7%	8.4%	3.6%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	75.0%	15.4%	9.6%	0.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	31	70.0%	13.3%	10.0%	6.7%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	16	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	48	56.3%	16.7%	2.1%	25.0%
20	648	Portland, OR	72	80.6%	9.7%	1.4%	8.3%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	115	49.6%	43.5%	5.2%	1.7%
20	692	White City, OR	171	76.6%	14.6%	5.8%	2.9%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	12	16.7%	33.3%	8.3%	41.7%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	80	46.3%	46.3%	5.0%	2.5%
21	654	Reno, NV	14	85.7%	0.0%	7.1%	7.1%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	63	38.1%	49.2%	4.8%	7.9%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	44.8%	34.5%	13.8%	6.9%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	92	48.9%	27.2%	17.4%	6.5%
22	664	San Diego, CA	23	65.2%	30.4%	4.3%	0.0%
23	427	Fargo, ND	16	68.8%	25.0%	0.0%	6.3%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	40	55.0%	0.0%	2.5%	42.5%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	118	70.1%	6.8%	1.7%	21.4%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	56	64.3%	30.4%	3.6%	1.8%
23	636	Omaha, NE	18	61.1%	38.9%	0.0%	0.0%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	223	53.8%	41.7%	2.7%	1.8%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,078)				**42.9%**	**50.5%**	**3.9%**	**2.7%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=96)				**45.8%**	**46.8%**	**3.8%**	**3.6%**
SITE S.D.				**20.6%**	**23.0%**	**5.0%**	**7.0%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY05: VISN 1, Togus; VISN 10, Columbus; VISN 15; Poplar Bluff; VISN 18, El Paso; and VISN 19, Colorado Springs.

Table 13. Marital Status by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Married %	Separated, Widowed or Divorced %	Never Married %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	27	33.3%	55.6%	11.1%
1	518	Bedford, MA	258	4.3%	64.8%	30.9%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	4.0%	52.0%	44.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	119	10.1%	58.0%	31.9%
1	631	Northampton, MA	126	7.9%	58.7%	33.3%
1	650	Providence, RI	79	11.4%	59.5%	29.1%
1	689	West Haven, CT	24	4.2%	62.5%	33.3%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	100	14.1%	51.5%	34.3%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	31	20.0%	33.3%	46.7%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	73	2.7%	61.6%	35.6%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	47	12.8%	53.2%	34.0%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	91	11.0%	60.4%	28.6%
3	526	Bronx, NY	126	7.2%	51.2%	41.6%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	36	19.4%	38.9%	41.7%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	190	7.4%	60.3%	32.3%
3	620	Montrose, NY	131	5.4%	58.5%	36.2%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	71	9.9%	50.7%	39.4%
3	632	Northport, NY	80	2.5%	60.0%	37.5%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	11.1%	62.2%	26.7%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	277	4.7%	65.2%	30.1%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	72	4.2%	63.9%	31.9%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	134	9.0%	57.9%	33.1%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	49	10.2%	57.1%	32.7%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	39	10.3%	53.8%	35.9%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	111	21.6%	57.7%	20.7%
5	688	Washington, DC	92	7.6%	45.7%	46.7%
6	590	Hampton, VA	64	9.4%	64.1%	26.6%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	12.5%	62.5%	25.0%
6	652	Richmond, VA	19	26.3%	63.2%	10.5%
6	658	Salem, VA	73	9.6%	65.8%	24.7%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	136	8.8%	59.6%	31.6%
7	509	Augusta, GA	88	14.8%	65.9%	19.3%
7	534	Charleston, SC	33	6.1%	57.6%	36.4%
7	544	Columbia, SC	186	7.0%	69.4%	23.7%
7	557	Dublin, GA	52	2.0%	58.8%	39.2%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	138	9.5%	62.8%	27.7%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	127	16.5%	66.9%	16.5%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	82	6.1%	54.9%	39.0%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	85	10.6%	68.2%	21.2%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	58	5.2%	70.7%	24.1%
8	673	Tampa, FL	111	9.1%	68.2%	22.7%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	63	0.0%	73.0%	27.0%
9	596	Lexington, KY	19	11.8%	70.6%	17.6%
9	603	Louisville, KY	15	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%
9	614	Memphis, TN	49	6.1%	63.3%	30.6%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	93	3.3%	75.0%	21.7%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	48	6.3%	83.3%	10.4%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	157	5.7%	68.8%	25.5%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	169	4.8%	65.3%	29.9%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	193	4.7%	63.2%	32.1%
10	552	Dayton, OH	25	8.0%	68.0%	24.0%
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	37	16.2%	54.1%	29.7%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	52	11.5%	61.5%	26.9%
11	550	Danville, IL	32	3.1%	62.5%	34.4%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	8.9%	66.7%	24.4%

Table 13 cont. Marital Status by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Married %	Separated, Widowed or Divorced %	Never Married %
12	556	North Chicago, IL	166	6.6%	50.0%	43.4%
12	578	Hines, IL	25	8.0%	72.0%	20.0%
12	607	Madison, WI	32	9.4%	65.6%	25.0%
12	676	Tomah, WI	65	6.3%	65.6%	28.1%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	38	5.3%	65.8%	28.9%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	87	4.8%	75.0%	20.2%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	29	6.9%	69.0%	24.1%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	48	8.3%	60.4%	31.3%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	124	8.1%	70.7%	21.1%
16	580	Houston, TX	222	8.1%	66.5%	25.3%
16	586	Jackson, MS	43	9.3%	83.3%	7.4%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	125	2.4%	76.8%	20.8%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	59	13.6%	62.7%	23.7%
17	549	Dallas, TX	91	16.5%	51.6%	31.9%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	45	6.7%	68.9%	24.4%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	13.7%	66.1%	20.2%
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX	325	7.1%	69.8%	23.1%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	41	14.6%	65.9%	19.5%
17	674	Temple, TX	207	6.3%	71.0%	22.7%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	54	2.0%	78.0%	20.0%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	83	4.9%	72.0%	23.2%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	13.5%	61.5%	25.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	31	6.5%	74.2%	19.4%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	16	6.3%	87.5%	6.3%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	48	6.3%	60.4%	33.3%
20	648	Portland, OR	72	11.1%	62.5%	26.4%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	115	8.7%	62.6%	28.7%
20	692	White City, OR	171	5.3%	69.6%	25.1%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	12	16.7%	41.7%	41.7%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	80	6.3%	60.8%	32.9%
21	654	Reno, NV	14	21.4%	50.0%	28.6%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	63	7.9%	61.9%	30.2%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	6.7%	63.3%	30.0%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	92	7.6%	65.2%	27.2%
22	664	San Diego, CA	23	26.1%	39.1%	34.8%
23	427	Fargo, ND	16	6.3%	75.0%	18.8%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	40	10.0%	65.0%	25.0%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	118	5.2%	62.1%	32.8%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	56	10.7%	62.5%	26.8%
23	636	Omaha, NE	18	16.7%	50.0%	33.3%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	223	9.0%	53.8%	37.2%
VETERAN AVERAGE (n=8,078)				**8.2%**	**63.3%**	**28.6%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=96)				**9.2%**	**62.6%**	**28.2%**
SITE S.D.				**5.7%**	**9.2%**	**8.1%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY05: VISN 1, Togus; VISN 10, Columbus; VISN 15; Poplar Bluff; VISN 18, El Paso; and VISN 19, Colorado Springs.

Table 14. Educational History by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	< 12 Years %	12 Years %	> 12 Years %
1	405	**White River Junction, VT**	27	3.7%	48.1%	48.1%
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	258	8.9%	50.4%	40.7%
1	523	**Boston, MA**	25	0.0%	76.0%	24.0%
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	119	4.2%	52.9%	42.9%
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	126	6.3%	57.1%	36.5%
1	650	**Providence, RI**	79	5.1%	43.0%	51.9%
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	24	8.3%	45.8%	45.8%
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	100	9.0%	42.0%	49.0%
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	31	0.0%	87.1%	12.9%
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	73	17.8%	52.1%	30.1%
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	47	4.3%	44.7%	51.1%
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	91	6.6%	52.7%	40.7%
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	126	9.5%	49.2%	41.3%
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**	36	8.3%	44.4%	47.2%
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	190	7.4%	70.5%	22.1%
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	131	4.6%	55.0%	40.5%
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	71	7.0%	53.5%	39.4%
3	632	**Northport, NY**	80	7.5%	47.5%	45.0%
4	529	**Butler, PA**	45	2.2%	62.2%	35.6%
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	277	7.6%	54.9%	37.5%
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	72	2.8%	68.1%	29.2%
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	134	3.7%	61.9%	34.3%
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	49	6.1%	55.1%	38.8%
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	39	2.6%	38.5%	59.0%
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	111	15.3%	49.5%	35.1%
5	688	**Washington, DC**	92	12.0%	50.0%	38.0%
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	64	9.4%	53.1%	37.5%
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	24	4.2%	54.2%	41.7%
6	652	**Richmond, VA**	19	26.3%	26.3%	47.4%
6	658	**Salem, VA**	73	4.1%	58.9%	37.0%
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	136	4.4%	43.4%	52.2%
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	88	8.0%	44.3%	47.7%
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	33	9.1%	63.6%	27.3%
7	544	**Columbia, SC**	186	5.4%	47.3%	47.3%
7	557	**Dublin, GA**	52	5.8%	63.5%	30.8%
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	138	7.2%	42.0%	50.7%
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	127	3.9%	44.1%	52.0%
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	82	12.2%	46.3%	41.5%
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	85	7.1%	49.4%	43.5%
8	573	**Gainesville/Lake City, FL**	58	5.2%	44.8%	50.0%
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	111	2.7%	53.2%	44.1%
8	673OR	**Orlando, FL**	63	6.3%	84.1%	9.5%
9	596	**Lexington, KY**	19	26.3%	36.8%	36.8%
9	603	**Louisville, KY**	15	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	49	12.2%	40.8%	46.9%
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	93	4.3%	51.6%	44.1%
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	48	14.6%	56.3%	29.2%
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	157	9.6%	51.0%	39.5%
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	169	7.7%	49.1%	43.2%
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	193	7.8%	58.0%	34.2%
10	552	**Dayton, OH**	25	8.0%	44.0%	48.0%
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	37	2.7%	40.5%	56.8%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	52	7.7%	44.2%	48.1%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	32	6.3%	56.3%	37.5%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	46	10.9%	32.6%	56.5%

Table 14 cont. Educational History by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	< 12 Years %	12 Years %	> 12 Years %
12	556	North Chicago, IL	166	6.0%	58.4%	35.5%
12	578	Hines, IL	25	16.0%	40.0%	44.0%
12	607	Madison, WI	32	9.4%	43.8%	46.9%
12	676	Tomah, WI	65	9.2%	64.6%	26.2%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	38	10.5%	68.4%	21.1%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	87	4.6%	70.1%	25.3%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	29	10.3%	58.6%	31.0%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	48	6.3%	58.3%	35.4%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	124	7.3%	60.5%	32.3%
16	580	Houston, TX	222	7.7%	58.1%	34.2%
16	586	Jackson, MS	43	7.4%	50.0%	42.6%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	125	4.8%	56.8%	38.4%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	59	6.8%	44.1%	49.2%
17	549	Dallas, TX	91	2.2%	61.5%	36.3%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	45	6.7%	55.6%	37.8%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	8.9%	61.3%	29.8%
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX	325	6.8%	56.0%	37.2%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	41	2.4%	46.3%	51.2%
17	674	Temple, TX	207	4.8%	46.4%	48.8%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	54	5.6%	38.9%	55.6%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	83	4.8%	39.8%	55.4%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	5.8%	50.0%	44.2%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	31	3.2%	51.6%	45.2%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	16	12.5%	68.8%	18.8%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	48	6.3%	43.8%	50.0%
20	648	Portland, OR	72	5.6%	45.8%	48.6%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	115	1.7%	51.3%	47.0%
20	692	White City, OR	171	5.3%	49.7%	45.0%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	12	0.0%	58.3%	41.7%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	80	7.5%	58.8%	33.8%
21	654	Reno, NV	14	0.0%	42.9%	57.1%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	63	9.5%	44.4%	46.0%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	6.7%	43.3%	50.0%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	92	5.4%	46.7%	47.8%
22	664	San Diego, CA	23	4.3%	34.8%	60.9%
23	427	Fargo, ND	16	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	40	5.0%	57.5%	37.5%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	118	2.5%	53.4%	44.1%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	56	3.6%	39.3%	57.1%
23	636	Omaha, NE	18	0.0%	72.2%	27.8%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	223	**3.1%**	**57.0%**	**39.9%**
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,078)				6.6%	52.8%	40.6%
SITE AVERAGE (N=96)				6.7%	52.2%	41.1%
SITE S.D.				4.5%	10.4%	9.9%

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY05:   VISN 1, Togus; VISN 10, Columbus; VISN 15, Poplar Bluff; VISN 18, El Paso; and VISN 19, Colorado Springs.

Table 15. Military Service Era by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Persian Gulf %	Post-Vietnam %	Vietnam %	Pre-Vietnam %	Korean %	All Other Service Eras %
1	405	**White River Junction, VT**	27	7.4%	55.6%	37.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	258	5.8%	49.6%	40.7%	2.7%	1.2%	0.0%
1	523	**Boston, MA**	25	12.0%	32.0%	52.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	119	17.8%	43.2%	37.3%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	126	4.8%	47.6%	41.3%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%
1	650	**Providence, RI**	79	8.9%	39.2%	48.1%	2.5%	1.3%	0.0%
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	24	4.2%	41.7%	54.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	100	5.1%	60.6%	34.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	31	0.0%	67.7%	32.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	73	2.7%	56.2%	39.7%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	47	14.9%	55.3%	25.5%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	91	9.9%	64.8%	24.2%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	126	5.6%	63.5%	29.4%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**	36	13.9%	47.2%	38.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	190	6.3%	65.8%	26.3%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	131	8.4%	61.8%	29.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	71	5.6%	43.7%	43.7%	7.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	632	**Northport, NY**	80	16.5%	49.4%	31.6%	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%
4	529	**Butler, PA**	45	11.1%	60.0%	28.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	277	11.9%	43.3%	41.9%	2.5%	0.4%	0.0%
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	72	6.9%	59.7%	31.9%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	134	5.2%	48.5%	43.3%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	49	6.4%	42.6%	48.9%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	39	17.9%	38.5%	43.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	111	6.3%	40.5%	50.5%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%
5	688	**Washington, DC**	92	4.3%	45.7%	48.9%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	64	3.1%	67.2%	28.1%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	24	4.2%	41.7%	50.0%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%
6	652	**Richmond, VA**	19	0.0%	42.1%	57.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	658	**Salem, VA**	73	9.6%	45.2%	41.1%	4.1%	0.0%	0.0%
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	136	3.0%	58.5%	37.0%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	88	3.5%	49.4%	45.9%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	33	12.5%	53.1%	25.0%	9.4%	0.0%	0.0%
7	544	**Columbia, SC**	186	7.5%	50.0%	39.8%	2.2%	0.5%	0.0%
7	557	**Dublin, GA**	52	7.7%	42.3%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	138	8.7%	57.2%	33.3%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	127	8.7%	53.5%	37.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	82	8.5%	62.2%	29.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	85	9.4%	52.9%	37.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
8	573	**Gainesville/Lake City, FL**	58	20.7%	43.1%	29.3%	6.9%	0.0%	0.0%
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	111	6.4%	57.3%	34.5%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%
8	673OR	**Orlando, FL**	63	3.2%	63.5%	30.2%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%
9	596	**Lexington, KY**	19	15.8%	52.6%	31.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9	603	**Louisville, KY**	15	6.7%	46.7%	46.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	49	0.0%	59.2%	34.7%	4.1%	0.0%	2.0%
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	93	14.0%	48.4%	37.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	48	4.2%	54.2%	41.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	157	11.5%	54.8%	32.5%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	169	8.3%	56.8%	32.5%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	193	6.2%	68.4%	24.9%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%
10	552	**Dayton, OH**	25	8.0%	68.0%	24.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Table 15 cont. Military Service Era by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Persian Gulf %	Post-Vietnam %	Vietnam %	Pre-Vietnam %	Korean %	All Other Service Eras %
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	37	10.8%	29.7%	54.1%	5.4%	0.0%	0.0%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	52	15.7%	49.0%	35.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	32	6.5%	41.9%	51.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	46	10.9%	50.0%	39.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	166	5.4%	71.1%	22.3%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	25	8.0%	32.0%	56.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12	607	**Madison, WI**	32	0.0%	56.3%	43.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	65	7.7%	41.5%	47.7%	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	38	5.3%	44.7%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
15	589	**Kansas City, MO**	87	4.6%	60.9%	32.2%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%
15	589A5	**Topeka, KS**	29	13.8%	34.5%	48.3%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%
15	589A6	**Leavenworth, KS**	48	6.3%	56.3%	37.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	124	12.1%	44.4%	43.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	222	4.5%	40.5%	52.7%	1.8%	0.5%	0.0%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	43	11.1%	27.8%	61.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	125	14.4%	67.2%	18.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	59	10.2%	35.6%	54.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	91	13.3%	46.7%	38.9%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	45	8.9%	57.8%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	124	13.0%	36.6%	46.3%	3.3%	0.0%	0.8%
17	549DT	**Dallas (downtown), TX**	325	7.1%	49.8%	42.2%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	41	7.3%	61.0%	31.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	207	10.1%	62.3%	27.1%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	54	9.3%	50.0%	38.9%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	83	10.8%	43.4%	41.0%	2.4%	2.4%	0.0%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	52	5.8%	51.9%	36.5%	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	31	6.5%	41.9%	51.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
19	666	**Sheridan, WY**	16	6.3%	25.0%	68.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	48	12.5%	50.0%	37.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	72	6.9%	50.0%	43.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	115	20.9%	45.2%	33.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
20	692	**White City, OR**	171	6.4%	42.7%	49.7%	0.6%	0.0%	0.6%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	12	0.0%	50.0%	41.7%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	80	8.8%	45.0%	46.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	14	0.0%	28.6%	50.0%	14.3%	7.1%	0.0%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	63	9.5%	54.0%	30.2%	4.8%	1.6%	0.0%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	30	3.3%	43.3%	50.0%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	92	12.0%	41.3%	43.5%	2.2%	1.1%	0.0%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	23	4.3%	69.6%	21.7%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%
23	437	**Fargo, ND**	16	6.3%	37.5%	56.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
23	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	40	2.5%	57.5%	35.0%	2.5%	2.5%	0.0%
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	118	7.6%	50.0%	40.7%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	56	10.7%	32.1%	55.4%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%
23	636	**Omaha, NE**	18	16.7%	44.4%	38.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	223	7.6%	52.0%	34.5%	3.6%	0.4%	1.8%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,078)				**8.4%**	**51.4%**	**38.2%**	**1.7%**	**0.2%**	**0.1%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=96)				**8.3%**	**49.7%**	**39.9%**	**1.8%**	**0.3%**	**0.1%**
SITE S.D.				**4.5%**	**10.3%**	**9.8%**	**2.4%**	**0.9%**	**0.3%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY05: VISN 1, Togus; VISN 10, Columbus; VISN 15, Poplar Bluff; VISN 18, El Paso; and VISN 19, Colorado Springs.

Table 16. Referral Source to CWT/VI Program by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	VA Inpatient %	VA Outpatient %	VA Domiciliary %	Non-VA Health Care %	Self- Referred %	Vet Center %	Other %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	27	14.8%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	18.5%	0.0%	0.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	258	7.0%	43.4%	36.4%	1.2%	5.0%	1.2%	5.8%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	16.0%	52.0%	28.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	119	10.9%	8.4%	79.8%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%
1	631	Northampton, MA	126	19.0%	30.2%	0.0%	29.4%	14.3%	7.1%	0.0%
1	650	Providence, RI	79	8.9%	62.0%	2.5%	8.9%	11.4%	1.3%	5.1%
1	689	West Haven, CT	24	0.0%	95.8%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	100	0.0%	85.0%	8.0%	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%	2.0%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	31	0.0%	6.5%	80.6%	0.0%	9.7%	3.2%	0.0%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	73	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	47	0.0%	85.1%	2.1%	0.0%	8.5%	0.0%	4.3%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	91	3.3%	16.5%	31.9%	4.4%	41.8%	0.0%	2.2%
3	526	Bronx, NY	126	0.0%	23.8%	0.8%	5.6%	64.3%	0.0%	5.6%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	36	0.0%	97.2%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	190	18.9%	0.0%	80.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%
3	620	Montrose, NY	131	1.5%	7.6%	90.1%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	71	1.4%	60.6%	33.8%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%
3	632	Northport, NY	80	8.8%	78.8%	7.5%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	0.0%	2.2%	91.1%	0.0%	4.4%	0.0%	2.2%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	277	1.1%	2.5%	96.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	72	98.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	134	2.2%	29.1%	49.3%	0.0%	6.7%	9.0%	3.7%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	49	20.4%	77.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	39	23.7%	5.3%	2.6%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	65.8%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	111	0.0%	17.1%	82.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5	688	Washington, DC	92	3.3%	85.9%	4.3%	2.2%	1.1%	3.3%	0.0%
6	590	Hampton, VA	64	4.7%	3.1%	90.6%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	58.3%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%
6	652	Richmond, VA	19	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	658	Salem, VA	73	9.6%	12.3%	1.4%	1.4%	1.4%	1.4%	72.6%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	136	0.0%	95.6%	0.0%	3.7%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%
7	509	Augusta, GA	88	2.3%	77.3%	1.1%	0.0%	17.0%	1.1%	1.1%
7	534	Charleston, SC	33	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	544	Columbia, SC	186	0.0%	96.8%	0.0%	1.1%	1.6%	0.0%	0.5%
7	557	Dublin, GA	52	0.0%	1.9%	96.2%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	138	18.1%	16.7%	61.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	127	5.5%	63.0%	0.0%	0.0%	30.7%	0.8%	0.0%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	82	3.7%	13.4%	63.4%	0.0%	17.1%	0.0%	2.4%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	85	1.2%	95.3%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%	0.0%	0.0%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	58	0.0%	20.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	79.3%
8	673	Tampa, FL	111	0.9%	85.6%	0.0%	3.6%	3.6%	0.0%	6.3%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	63	7.9%	42.9%	0.0%	9.5%	28.6%	11.1%	0.0%
9	596	Lexington, KY	19	5.3%	94.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9	603	Louisville, KY	15	0.0%	80.0%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	49	10.2%	69.4%	0.0%	2.0%	6.1%	0.0%	12.2%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	93	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	48	2.1%	97.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	157	12.7%	75.8%	11.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	169	8.9%	9.5%	58.6%	6.5%	16.6%	0.0%	0.0%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	193	0.5%	47.7%	50.8%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
10	552	Dayton, OH	25	40.0%	36.0%	16.0%	0.0%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Table 16 cont. Referral Source to CWT/VI Program by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	VA Inpatient %	VA Outpatient %	VA Domiciliary %	Non-VA Health Care %	Self- Referred %	Vet Center %	Other %
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	37	5.4%	81.1%	0.0%	0.0%	10.8%	2.7%	0.0%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	52	25.0%	40.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	34.6%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	32	3.1%	90.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	3.1%	0.0%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	46	0.0%	87.0%	0.0%	4.3%	4.3%	0.0%	4.3%
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	166	3.0%	15.1%	77.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%	3.0%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	25	16.0%	72.0%	0.0%	4.0%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12	607	**Madison, WI**	32	0.0%	37.5%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	0.0%	59.4%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	65	3.1%	70.8%	0.0%	13.8%	7.7%	0.0%	4.6%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	38	2.6%	5.3%	71.1%	2.6%	13.2%	2.6%	2.6%
15	589	**Kansas City, MO**	87	12.6%	79.3%	6.9%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
15	589A5	**Topeka, KS**	29	0.0%	31.0%	41.4%	0.0%	13.8%	10.3%	3.4%
15	589A6	**Leavenworth, KS**	48	2.1%	0.0%	97.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	124	6.5%	33.1%	52.4%	0.0%	8.1%	0.0%	0.0%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	222	0.5%	98.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	43	7.4%	37.0%	0.0%	7.4%	42.6%	0.0%	5.6%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	125	0.0%	23.2%	42.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	34.4%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	59	5.1%	86.4%	0.0%	1.7%	5.1%	1.7%	0.0%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	91	11.0%	37.4%	12.1%	1.1%	31.9%	0.0%	6.6%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	45	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	124	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	89.5%	4.0%	0.0%
17	549DT	**Dallas (downtown), TX**	325	0.3%	60.9%	0.3%	0.9%	36.6%	0.9%	0.0%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	41	0.0%	51.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	48.8%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	207	17.9%	18.8%	36.7%	0.5%	23.2%	1.4%	1.4%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	54	14.8%	14.8%	5.6%	16.7%	42.6%	0.0%	5.6%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	83	0.0%	1.2%	86.7%	4.8%	7.2%	0.0%	0.0%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	52	1.9%	71.2%	0.0%	0.0%	26.9%	0.0%	0.0%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	31	0.0%	93.5%	0.0%	0.0%	6.5%	0.0%	0.0%
19	666	**Sheridan, WY**	16	31.3%	6.3%	0.0%	6.3%	50.0%	0.0%	6.3%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	48	2.1%	2.1%	60.4%	8.3%	16.7%	4.2%	6.3%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	72	0.0%	59.7%	1.4%	5.6%	30.6%	0.0%	2.8%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	115	14.8%	15.7%	11.3%	2.6%	41.7%	3.5%	10.4%
20	692	**White City, OR**	171	0.0%	1.2%	98.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	12	0.0%	91.7%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	80	10.0%	30.0%	53.8%	2.5%	2.5%	1.3%	0.0%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	14	0.0%	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	7.1%	0.0%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	63	1.6%	36.5%	0.0%	4.8%	57.1%	0.0%	0.0%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	30	6.7%	93.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	92	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	23	0.0%	82.6%	0.0%	4.3%	13.0%	0.0%	0.0%
23	437	**Fargo, ND**	16	0.0%	87.5%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%
23	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	40	5.0%	40.0%	15.0%	2.5%	35.0%	2.5%	0.0%
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	118	3.4%	0.8%	92.4%	0.8%	1.7%	0.8%	0.0%
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	56	5.4%	39.3%	3.6%	21.4%	26.8%	3.6%	0.0%
23	636	**Omaha, NE**	18	5.6%	61.1%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	223	3.1%	30.9%	55.2%	0.0%	10.8%	0.0%	0.0%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,078)				**6.3%**	**42.4%**	**32.5%**	**2.2%**	**11.6%**	**0.9%**	**4.2%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=96)				**7.1%**	**47.6%**	**24.9%**	**2.4%**	**11.6%**	**1.0%**	**5.5%**
SITE S.D.				**13.2%**	**34.7%**	**34.6%**	**4.9%**	**17.0%**	**2.2%**	**15.2%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY05: VISN 1, Togus; VISN 10, Columbus; VISN 15, Poplar Bluff; VISN 18, El Paso; and VISN 19, Colorado Springs.

Table 17. Usual Employment Pattern during the Three Years Prior to Admission by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Usually Employed or in a Constructive Activity†† %	Retired or Disabled %	Usually Unemployed %	Other %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	27	63.0%	18.5%	14.8%	3.7%
1	518	Bedford, MA	258	52.7%	10.9%	32.4%	3.9%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	36.0%	16.0%	36.0%	12.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	119	73.7%	8.5%	15.3%	2.5%
1	631	Northampton, MA	126	78.6%	2.4%	18.3%	0.8%
1	650	Providence, RI	79	36.7%	35.4%	26.6%	1.3%
1	689	West Haven, CT	24	58.3%	8.3%	33.3%	0.0%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	100	63.0%	3.0%	28.0%	6.0%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	31	96.8%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	73	82.2%	0.0%	13.7%	4.1%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	47	66.0%	8.5%	21.3%	4.3%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	91	71.1%	1.1%	27.8%	0.0%
3	526	Bronx, NY	126	54.0%	3.2%	41.3%	1.6%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	36	71.4%	0.0%	17.1%	11.4%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	190	87.8%	0.5%	11.2%	0.5%
3	620	Montrose, NY	131	87.0%	0.0%	11.5%	1.5%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	71	38.0%	1.4%	52.1%	8.5%
3	632	Northport, NY	80	72.5%	3.8%	21.3%	2.5%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	80.0%	2.2%	15.6%	2.2%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	277	81.2%	1.1%	13.8%	4.0%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	72	62.5%	0.0%	34.7%	2.8%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	134	83.6%	2.2%	13.4%	0.7%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	49	61.7%	4.3%	34.0%	0.0%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	39	61.5%	2.6%	33.3%	2.6%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	111	73.0%	9.9%	17.1%	0.0%
5	688	Washington, DC	92	65.9%	4.4%	25.3%	4.4%
6	590	Hampton, VA	64	96.9%	0.0%	3.1%	0.0%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	91.7%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%
6	652	Richmond, VA	19	57.9%	15.8%	26.3%	0.0%
6	658	Salem, VA	73	86.3%	2.7%	11.0%	0.0%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	136	85.3%	0.0%	12.5%	2.2%
7	509	Augusta, GA	88	64.8%	11.4%	23.9%	0.0%
7	534	Charleston, SC	33	87.9%	0.0%	12.1%	0.0%
7	544	Columbia, SC	186	67.7%	7.5%	19.9%	4.8%
7	557	Dublin, GA	52	90.4%	0.0%	9.6%	0.0%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	138	76.8%	0.7%	21.0%	1.4%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	127	65.4%	9.4%	25.2%	0.0%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	82	79.0%	1.2%	16.0%	3.7%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	85	98.8%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	58	75.9%	6.9%	15.5%	1.7%
8	673	Tampa, FL	111	95.5%	0.0%	4.5%	0.0%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	63	96.8%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%
9	596	Lexington, KY	19	73.7%	0.0%	10.5%	15.8%
9	603	Louisville, KY	15	73.3%	20.0%	6.7%	0.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	49	77.6%	2.0%	16.3%	4.1%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	93	90.3%	1.1%	8.6%	0.0%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	48	87.5%	4.2%	8.3%	0.0%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	157	65.4%	12.2%	11.5%	10.9%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	169	81.5%	8.3%	8.9%	1.2%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	193	61.1%	3.1%	33.7%	2.1%
10	552	Dayton, OH	25	72.0%	0.0%	24.0%	4.0%

Table 17 cont. Usual Employment Pattern during the Three Years Prior to Admission by Site for FY05 †

VISN	SITE		N	Usually Employed or in a Constructive Activity†† %	Retired or Disabled %	Usually Unemployed %	Other %
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	37	57.1%	14.3%	28.6%	0.0%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	52	78.4%	2.0%	15.7%	3.9%
11	550	Danville, IL	32	56.3%	9.4%	34.4%	0.0%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	69.6%	8.7%	19.6%	2.2%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	166	87.3%	0.6%	10.8%	1.2%
12	578	Hines, IL	25	68.0%	16.0%	16.0%	0.0%
12	607	Madison, WI	32	40.6%	18.8%	31.3%	9.4%
12	676	Tomah, WI	65	70.8%	12.3%	16.9%	0.0%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	38	76.3%	2.6%	18.4%	2.6%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	87	89.7%	1.1%	5.7%	3.4%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	29	58.6%	6.9%	31.0%	3.4%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	48	82.6%	0.0%	17.4%	0.0%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	124	87.0%	1.6%	8.9%	2.4%
16	580	Houston, TX	222	60.8%	3.6%	27.9%	7.7%
16	586	Jackson, MS	43	63.0%	16.7%	16.7%	3.7%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	125	85.6%	0.0%	13.6%	0.8%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	59	74.6%	5.1%	15.3%	5.1%
17	549	Dallas, TX	91	68.1%	0.0%	29.7%	2.2%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	45	82.2%	2.2%	15.6%	0.0%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	67.5%	10.6%	22.0%	0.0%
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX	325	80.6%	4.6%	11.1%	3.7%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	41	75.6%	0.0%	19.5%	4.9%
17	674	Temple, TX	207	78.3%	1.4%	14.5%	5.8%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	54	70.4%	3.7%	24.1%	1.9%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	83	88.0%	2.4%	8.4%	1.2%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	64.7%	9.8%	25.5%	0.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	31	74.2%	12.9%	12.9%	0.0%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	16	62.5%	6.3%	31.3%	0.0%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	48	64.6%	4.2%	20.8%	10.4%
20	648	Portland, OR	72	88.7%	1.4%	9.9%	0.0%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	115	79.1%	5.2%	14.8%	0.9%
20	692	White City, OR	171	67.8%	4.7%	27.5%	0.0%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	12	75.0%	8.3%	16.7%	0.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	80	59.5%	3.8%	34.2%	2.5%
21	654	Reno, NV	14	28.6%	57.1%	7.1%	7.1%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	63	54.0%	6.3%	39.7%	0.0%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	70.0%	26.7%	3.3%	0.0%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	92	64.1%	9.8%	22.8%	3.3%
22	664	San Diego, CA	23	43.5%	8.7%	47.8%	0.0%
23	437	Fargo, ND	16	81.3%	12.5%	0.0%	6.3%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	40	62.5%	12.5%	17.5%	7.5%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	118	80.3%	6.0%	10.3%	3.4%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	56	85.7%	0.0%	12.5%	1.8%
23	636	Omaha, NE	18	72.2%	0.0%	22.2%	5.6%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	223	78.8%	8.6%	12.2%	0.5%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,078)				**73.9%**	**5.0%**	**18.5%**	**2.6%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=96)				**72.2%**	**6.3%**	**18.9%**	**2.6%**
SITE S.D.				**14.3%**	**8.3%**	**10.4%**	**3.2%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY05: VISN 1, Togus; VISN 10, Columbus; VISN 15, Poplar Bluff; VISN 18, El Paso; and VISN 19, Colorado Springs.

†† Includes full- and part-time employment, student and/or volunteer.

Table 18. Days Worked for Pay During the Month Prior to CWT/VI Admission by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	0 Days %	1-19 Days %	> 19 Days %	Mean Number of Days Worked for Pay Past 30 #	Mean Employment Income Past 30 Days $
1	405	**White River Junction, VT**	27	88.9%	11.1%	0.0%	1.0	$66.67
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	258	88.8%	8.1%	3.1%	1.2	$61.12
1	523	**Boston, MA**	25	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	119	96.6%	3.4%	0.0%	0.4	$16.25
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	126	94.4%	4.0%	1.6%	0.8	$21.27
1	650	**Providence, RI**	79	96.2%	3.8%	0.0%	0.4	$24.75
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	24	91.7%	0.0%	8.3%	2.0	$76.25
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	100	90.0%	9.0%	1.0%	0.7	$32.64
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	31	96.8%	0.0%	3.2%	1.0	$38.71
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	73	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	47	87.2%	10.6%	2.1%	1.5	$49.34
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	91	97.8%	0.0%	2.2%	0.5	$13.19
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	126	94.4%	3.2%	2.4%	0.7	$23.33
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**	36	83.3%	13.9%	2.8%	2.0	$113.89
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	190	98.9%	1.1%	0.0%	0.1	$2.11
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	131	99.2%	0.8%	0.0%	0.1	$1.72
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	71	97.2%	2.8%	0.0%	0.3	$14.08
3	632	**Northport, NY**	80	92.5%	3.8%	3.8%	1.2	$21.28
4	529	**Butler, PA**	45	97.8%	2.2%	0.0%	0.2	$6.67
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	277	96.8%	2.2%	1.1%	0.5	$17.83
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	72	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	134	94.8%	3.7%	1.5%	0.7	$22.76
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	49	98.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.3	$4.08
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	39	97.4%	0.0%	2.6%	0.5	$1.54
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	111	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
5	688	**Washington, DC**	92	96.7%	3.3%	0.0%	0.3	$10.91
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	64	96.9%	1.6%	1.6%	0.5	$14.84
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	24	54.2%	41.7%	4.2%	5.5	$244.17
6	652	**Richmond, VA**	19	84.2%	15.8%	0.0%	1.1	$34.74
6	658	**Salem, VA**	73	83.6%	12.3%	4.1%	1.9	$79.81
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	136	70.6%	23.5%	5.9%	2.5	$77.71
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	88	80.7%	15.9%	3.4%	1.9	$63.56
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	33	84.8%	12.1%	3.0%	1.4	$87.52
7	544	**Columbia, SC**	186	72.6%	19.4%	8.1%	3.3	$109.56
7	557	**Dublin, GA**	52	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	138	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	127	88.2%	11.8%	0.0%	1.0	$42.46
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	82	97.6%	2.4%	0.0%	0.1	$4.88
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	85	95.3%	2.4%	2.4%	0.6	$19.08
8	573	**Gainesville/Lake City, FL**	58	86.2%	12.1%	1.7%	1.7	$50.90
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	111	98.2%	1.8%	0.0%	0.1	$10.45
8	673OR	**Orlando, FL**	63	95.2%	4.8%	0.0%	0.7	$15.87
9	596	**Lexington, KY**	19	68.4%	21.1%	10.5%	5.1	$169.95
9	603	**Louisville, KY**	15	93.3%	6.7%	0.0%	0.1	$8.93
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	49	73.5%	18.4%	8.2%	3.1	$93.78
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	93	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	48	97.9%	2.1%	0.0%	0.3	$18.75
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	157	84.7%	10.2%	5.1%	1.9	$61.13
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	169	90.5%	7.7%	1.8%	1.0	$45.89
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	193	97.4%	1.6%	1.0%	0.4	$14.79
10	552	**Dayton, OH**	25	96.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.2	$8.48

Table 18 cont. Days Worked for Pay During the Month Prior to CWT/VI Admission by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	0 Days %	1-19 Days %	> 19 Days %	Mean Number of Days Worked for Pay Past 30 #	Mean Employment Income Past 30 Days $
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	37	83.8%	10.8%	5.4%	1.4	$14.59
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	52	90.4%	9.6%	0.0%	1.0	$19.27
11	550	Danville, IL	32	87.5%	6.3%	6.3%	1.9	$52.34
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	84.8%	10.9%	4.3%	1.6	$60.70
12	556	North Chicago, IL	166	97.6%	1.8%	0.6%	0.4	$15.51
12	578	Hines, IL	25	80.0%	16.0%	4.0%	1.2	$86.28
12	607	Madison, WI	32	93.8%	6.3%	0.0%	0.1	$7.47
12	676	Tomah, WI	65	95.4%	4.6%	0.0%	0.4	$14.97
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	38	92.1%	5.3%	2.6%	0.9	$76.55
15	589	Kansas City, MO	87	96.6%	3.4%	0.0%	0.3	$22.39
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	29	75.9%	6.9%	17.2%	4.6	$95.28
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	48	97.9%	2.1%	0.0%	0.3	$6.25
16	520	Biloxi, MS	124	89.5%	10.5%	0.0%	0.6	$18.97
16	580	Houston, TX	222	94.6%	4.5%	0.9%	0.5	$19.51
16	586	Jackson, MS	43	44.4%	48.1%	7.4%	4.0	$131.15
16	598	Little Rock, AR	125	97.6%	2.4%	0.0%	0.3	$18.22
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	59	94.9%	5.1%	0.0%	0.3	$6.66
17	549	Dallas, TX	91	92.3%	5.5%	2.2%	0.7	$15.35
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	45	97.8%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0	$0.89
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	67.7%	20.2%	12.1%	4.4	$137.10
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX	325	83.4%	14.2%	2.5%	1.2	$47.89
17	671	San Antonio, TX	41	90.2%	7.3%	2.4%	1.5	$43.90
17	674	Temple, TX	207	87.0%	10.6%	2.4%	1.1	$51.70
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	54	72.2%	13.0%	14.8%	4.9	$154.76
18	649	Prescott, AZ	83	92.8%	4.8%	2.4%	1.0	$45.93
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	96.2%	1.9%	1.9%	0.7	$24.04
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	31	90.3%	9.7%	0.0%	0.6	$21.13
19	666	Sheridan, WY	16	93.8%	6.3%	0.0%	0.4	$9.31
20	463	Anchorage, AK	48	89.6%	8.3%	2.1%	1.3	$19.79
20	648	Portland, OR	72	80.6%	16.7%	2.8%	1.4	$51.83
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	115	85.2%	11.3%	3.5%	1.7	$73.06
20	692	White City, OR	171	97.1%	2.3%	0.6%	0.4	$18.71
21	459	Honolulu, HI	12	83.3%	16.7%	0.0%	0.6	$25.00
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	80	98.8%	1.3%	0.0%	0.2	$10.00
21	654	Reno, NV	14	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
21	662	San Francisco, CA	63	95.2%	3.2%	1.6%	0.5	$6.65
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	90.0%	3.3%	6.7%	2.2	$44.10
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	92	97.8%	0.0%	2.2%	0.5	$8.70
22	664	San Diego, CA	23	95.7%	4.3%	0.0%	0.3	$34.78
23	437	Fargo, ND	16	93.8%	6.3%	0.0%	0.1	$6.25
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	40	92.5%	7.5%	0.0%	0.7	$18.50
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	118	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	56	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
23	636	Omaha, NE	18	83.3%	16.7%	0.0%	1.3	$69.44
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	223	94.2%	4.0%	1.8%	0.7	$43.06
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,078)				**91.3%**	**6.7%**	**2.0%**	**0.9**	**$34.62**
SITE AVERAGE (N=96)				**90.7%**	**7.2%**	**2.2%**	**1.0**	**$37.14**
SITE S.D.				**9.9%**	**8.0%**	**3.2%**	**1.2**	**$42.26**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY05: VISN 1, Togus; VISN 10, Columbus; VISN 15, Poplar Bluff; VISN 18, El Paso; and VISN 19, Colorado Springs.

Table 19. Prior CWT/VI Admission and Currently in a Domiciliary or VA Inpatient Unit at Time of Admission by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Prior CWT/VI Admission %	Currently in a Domiciliary or VA Inpatient Unit %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	27	22.2%	3.7%
1	518	Bedford, MA	258	54.3%	43.8%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	64.0%	20.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	119	40.3%	89.1%
1	631	Northampton, MA	126	44.8%	9.5%
1	650	Providence, RI	79	35.5%	16.5%
1	689	West Haven, CT	24	20.8%	8.3%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	100	38.4%	0.0%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	31	45.2%	80.6%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	73	34.2%	100.0%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	47	40.4%	0.0%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	91	30.8%	0.0%
3	526	Bronx, NY	126	38.9%	1.6%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	36	38.9%	0.0%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	190	35.5%	93.7%
3	620	Montrose, NY	131	33.1%	80.2%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	71	23.9%	28.2%
3	632	Northport, NY	80	62.8%	12.5%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	25.0%	88.9%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	277	40.1%	97.5%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	72	23.6%	0.0%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	134	50.7%	42.5%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	49	36.7%	16.3%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	39	46.2%	41.0%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	111	18.0%	82.0%
5	688	Washington, DC	92	41.3%	3.3%
6	590	Hampton, VA	64	23.4%	90.6%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	33.3%	8.3%
6	652	Richmond, VA	19	42.1%	0.0%
6	658	Salem, VA	73	34.3%	23.3%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	136	28.7%	0.0%
7	509	Augusta, GA	88	34.1%	36.4%
7	534	Charleston, SC	33	24.2%	0.0%
7	544	Columbia, SC	186	16.7%	0.0%
7	557	Dublin, GA	52	33.3%	96.2%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	138	13.0%	79.0%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	127	40.5%	6.3%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	82	26.8%	70.7%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	85	16.5%	1.2%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	58	21.1%	0.0%
8	673	Tampa, FL	111	13.6%	0.0%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	63	7.9%	98.4%
9	596	Lexington, KY	19	36.8%	5.3%
9	603	Louisville, KY	15	14.3%	6.7%
9	614	Memphis, TN	49	16.3%	2.0%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	93	12.9%	100.0%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	48	6.3%	0.0%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	157	41.7%	60.5%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	169	34.7%	68.6%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	193	28.4%	50.3%
10	552	Dayton, OH	25	28.0%	40.0%

Table 19 cont. Prior CWT/VI Admission and Currently in a Domiciliary or VA Inpatient Unit at Time of Admission by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Prior CWT/VI Admission %	Currently in a Domiciliary or VA Inpatient Unit %
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	37	27.0%	2.7%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	52	32.7%	15.4%
11	550	Danville, IL	32	50.0%	0.0%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	28.3%	2.2%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	166	29.1%	78.9%
12	578	Hines, IL	25	40.0%	8.0%
12	607	Madison, WI	32	21.9%	6.3%
12	676	Tomah, WI	65	32.3%	13.8%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	38	24.3%	76.3%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	87	51.7%	10.3%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	29	67.9%	13.8%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	48	2.1%	97.9%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	124	42.7%	72.6%
16	580	Houston, TX	222	39.4%	2.3%
16	586	Jackson, MS	43	20.4%	0.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	125	36.0%	42.4%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	59	40.7%	1.7%
17	549	Dallas, TX	91	43.3%	15.4%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	45	6.7%	97.8%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	40.3%	8.9%
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX	325	44.8%	0.3%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	41	12.2%	2.4%
17	674	Temple, TX	207	34.5%	91.8%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	54	27.8%	44.4%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	83	25.6%	86.7%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	9.8%	0.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	31	32.3%	0.0%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	16	37.5%	0.0%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	48	36.2%	50.0%
20	648	Portland, OR	72	29.2%	1.4%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	115	37.7%	58.3%
20	692	White City, OR	171	29.2%	97.7%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	12	16.7%	0.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	80	16.3%	56.3%
21	654	Reno, NV	14	57.1%	0.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	63	30.6%	0.0%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	20.0%	6.7%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	92	18.5%	0.0%
22	664	San Diego, CA	23	8.7%	0.0%
23	437	Fargo, ND	16	18.8%	6.3%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	40	50.0%	5.0%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	118	29.1%	94.1%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	56	30.4%	19.6%
23	636	Omaha, NE	18	27.8%	5.6%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	223	49.1%	59.5%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,078)				**33.5%**	**40.6%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=96)				**31.5%**	**31.8%**
SITE S.D.				**13.2%**	**36.2%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY05: VISN 1, Togus; VISN 10, Columbus; VISN 15, Poplar Bluff; VISN 18, El Paso; and VISN 19, Colorado Springs.

Table 20. Veterans' Report of Public Financial Support at Admission by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Service Connected for Psychiatry %	Service Connected for Other %	Non-Service Connected Pension %	Any VA Benefit %	Social Security Disability %	Any VA or Non-VA Disability %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	27	14.8%	11.1%	7.4%	25.9%	29.6%	44.4%
1	518	Bedford, MA	258	5.0%	11.6%	10.1%	24.8%	19.0%	31.8%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	4.0%	16.0%	4.0%	20.0%	16.0%	28.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	119	9.2%	16.8%	5.9%	27.7%	16.0%	34.5%
1	631	Northampton, MA	126	1.6%	15.1%	4.0%	20.6%	19.8%	32.5%
1	650	Providence, RI	79	20.3%	20.3%	8.9%	45.6%	53.2%	70.9%
1	689	West Haven, CT	24	12.5%	4.2%	8.3%	20.8%	20.8%	33.3%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	100	9.0%	16.0%	5.0%	24.0%	6.0%	25.0%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	31	3.2%	3.2%	3.2%	9.7%	0.0%	6.5%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	73	0.0%	11.0%	0.0%	11.0%	0.0%	11.0%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	47	2.1%	25.5%	2.1%	27.7%	8.5%	34.0%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	91	8.8%	11.0%	4.4%	23.1%	5.5%	20.9%
3	526	Bronx, NY	126	1.6%	10.3%	6.3%	18.3%	8.7%	18.3%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	36	5.6%	13.9%	0.0%	19.4%	13.9%	33.3%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	190	3.7%	12.1%	0.5%	15.3%	2.1%	16.8%
3	620	Montrose, NY	131	5.3%	8.4%	2.3%	15.3%	3.1%	15.3%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	71	8.5%	15.5%	11.3%	31.0%	22.5%	35.2%
3	632	Northport, NY	80	7.5%	18.8%	5.0%	28.8%	15.0%	37.5%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	0.0%	6.7%	4.4%	11.1%	4.4%	11.1%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	277	3.2%	10.5%	1.8%	13.7%	4.7%	15.9%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	72	1.4%	15.3%	0.0%	15.3%	1.4%	16.7%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	134	3.7%	14.9%	2.2%	19.4%	9.0%	23.9%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	49	2.0%	14.3%	4.1%	18.4%	20.4%	32.7%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	39	10.3%	20.5%	0.0%	23.1%	7.7%	28.2%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	111	5.4%	16.2%	9.9%	27.9%	2.7%	20.7%
5	688	Washington, DC	92	7.6%	12.0%	3.3%	20.7%	8.7%	21.7%
6	590	Hampton, VA	64	3.1%	6.3%	0.0%	9.4%	3.1%	12.5%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	0.0%	16.7%	8.3%	25.0%	4.2%	20.8%
6	652	Richmond, VA	19	0.0%	15.8%	5.3%	21.1%	15.8%	31.6%
6	658	Salem, VA	73	5.5%	9.6%	2.7%	13.7%	4.1%	15.1%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	136	2.2%	11.0%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	12.5%
7	509	Augusta, GA	88	8.0%	25.0%	8.0%	36.4%	12.5%	39.8%
7	534	Charleston, SC	33	0.0%	18.2%	3.0%	21.2%	3.0%	18.2%
7	544	Columbia, SC	186	4.3%	19.4%	5.9%	25.3%	8.1%	27.4%
7	557	Dublin, GA	52	1.9%	13.5%	0.0%	13.5%	0.0%	13.5%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	138	1.4%	14.5%	5.1%	20.3%	13.0%	26.8%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	127	11.0%	14.2%	1.6%	24.4%	15.7%	35.4%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	82	2.4%	20.7%	0.0%	23.2%	2.4%	24.4%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	85	5.9%	12.9%	1.2%	17.6%	0.0%	17.6%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	58	5.2%	22.4%	6.9%	31.0%	3.4%	25.9%
8	673	Tampa, FL	111	4.5%	16.2%	2.7%	23.4%	2.7%	24.3%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	63	0.0%	9.5%	0.0%	9.5%	0.0%	11.1%
9	596	Lexington, KY	19	5.3%	15.8%	0.0%	0.2	10.5%	26.3%
9	603	Louisville, KY	15	6.7%	6.7%	26.7%	0.4	13.3%	20.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	49	8.2%	14.3%	4.1%	0.2	6.1%	26.5%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	93	0.0%	15.1%	0.0%	0.2	0.0%	15.1%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	48	2.1%	14.6%	2.1%	0.2	4.2%	18.8%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	157	3.2%	15.3%	3.8%	0.2	1.9%	19.1%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	169	5.3%	14.2%	5.3%	0.2	5.3%	20.7%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	193	2.6%	12.4%	1.0%	16.1%	5.2%	19.7%
10	552	Dayton, OH	25	0.0%	16.0%	0.0%	16.0%	12.0%	28.0%

Table 20 cont. Veterans' Report of Public Financial Support at Admission by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Service Connected for Psychiatry %	Service Connected for Other %	Non-Service Connected Pension %	Any VA Benefit %	Social Security Disability %	Any VA or Non-VA Disability %
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	37	5.4%	2.7%	10.8%	18.9%	13.5%	24.3%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	52	3.8%	19.2%	0.0%	21.2%	1.9%	23.1%
11	550	Danville, IL	32	0.0%	3.1%	3.1%	6.3%	9.4%	12.5%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	10.9%	17.4%	4.3%	26.1%	0.0%	21.7%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	166	0.6%	12.7%	1.2%	13.9%	6.0%	17.5%
12	578	Hines, IL	25	12.0%	8.0%	16.0%	28.0%	20.0%	36.0%
12	607	Madison, WI	32	9.4%	15.6%	3.1%	28.1%	18.8%	40.6%
12	676	Tomah, WI	65	4.6%	16.9%	15.4%	35.4%	7.7%	24.6%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	38	5.3%	18.4%	13.2%	34.2%	2.6%	23.7%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	87	4.6%	16.1%	0.0%	20.7%	2.3%	21.8%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	29	6.9%	3.4%	3.4%	13.8%	13.8%	17.2%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	48	6.3%	4.2%	0.0%	10.4%	2.1%	12.5%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	124	0.8%	11.3%	0.0%	12.1%	4.8%	16.1%
16	580	Houston, TX	222	4.5%	6.8%	5.9%	16.7%	3.2%	14.4%
16	586	Jackson, MS	43	13.0%	9.3%	3.7%	22.2%	5.6%	20.4%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	125	4.8%	19.2%	0.0%	21.6%	0.0%	21.6%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	59	0.0%	17.2%	5.1%	22.0%	3.4%	22.0%
17	549	Dallas, TX	91	2.2%	12.1%	8.8%	23.1%	2.2%	16.5%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	45	0.0%	8.9%	6.7%	15.6%	0.0%	8.9%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	0.8%	12.1%	17.7%	29.0%	7.3%	20.2%
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX	325	3.1%	9.2%	12.0%	23.4%	4.9%	15.7%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	41	0.0%	14.6%	2.4%	17.1%	9.8%	24.4%
17	674	Temple, TX	207	2.4%	18.4%	2.4%	22.2%	2.4%	21.7%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	54	1.9%	11.1%	3.7%	16.7%	5.6%	16.7%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	83	1.2%	20.5%	1.2%	22.9%	3.6%	25.3%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	3.8%	11.5%	1.9%	17.3%	7.7%	21.2%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	31	3.2%	12.9%	0.0%	16.1%	3.2%	19.4%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	16	6.3%	12.5%	6.3%	18.8%	0.0%	12.5%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	48	6.3%	20.8%	6.3%	29.2%	4.2%	25.0%
20	648	Portland, OR	72	2.8%	8.3%	4.2%	13.9%	1.4%	11.1%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	115	3.5%	22.6%	0.0%	23.5%	7.8%	27.8%
20	692	White City, OR	171	2.9%	9.4%	4.7%	16.4%	4.7%	16.4%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	12	0.0%	16.7%	25.0%	41.7%	25.0%	41.7%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	80	6.3%	8.8%	5.0%	18.8%	6.3%	23.8%
21	654	Reno, NV	14	7.1%	14.3%	21.4%	42.9%	35.7%	50.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	63	6.3%	11.1%	19.0%	31.7%	20.6%	34.9%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	3.3%	23.3%	23.3%	46.7%	3.3%	30.0%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	92	6.5%	5.4%	7.6%	18.5%	17.4%	53.3%
22	664	San Diego, CA	23	8.7%	30.4%	21.7%	60.9%	8.7%	47.8%
23	437	Fargo, ND	16	0.0%	18.8%	6.3%	25.0%	25.0%	31.3%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	40	5.0%	7.5%	10.0%	20.0%	5.0%	12.5%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	118	0.8%	7.6%	6.8%	14.4%	3.4%	12.7%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	56	1.8%	12.5%	8.9%	23.2%	8.9%	23.2%
23	636	Omaha, NE	18	11.1%	16.7%	0.0%	22.2%	5.6%	22.2%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	223	7.6%	10.3%	8.5%	24.2%	19.3%	30.5%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,078)				**4.3%**	**13.3%**	**4.9%**	**21.0%**	**7.7%**	**22.9%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=96)				**4.6%**	**13.7%**	**5.6%**	**22.2%**	**8.6%**	**24.1%**
SITE S.D.				**3.8%**	**5.3%**	**5.9%**	**8.8%**	**8.7%**	**10.5%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY05: VISN 1, Togus; VISN 10, Columbus; VISN 15, Poplar Bluff; VISN 18, El Paso; and VISN 19, Colorado Springs.

Table 21. Income in the 30 Days Prior to Admission by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Mean Employment Income (month prior to admission) $	Mean Other Income†† (month prior to admission) $	Mean Total Income $
1	405	White River Junction, VT	27	$66.67	$546.67	$613.33
1	518	Bedford, MA	258	$61.12	$339.49	$400.61
1	523	Boston, MA	25	$0.00	$287.64	$287.64
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	119	$16.25	$329.94	$346.19
1	631	Northampton, MA	126	$21.27	$311.94	$333.21
1	650	Providence, RI	79	$24.75	$890.97	$915.72
1	689	West Haven, CT	24	$76.25	$461.42	$537.67
2	528	Buffalo, NY	100	$32.64	$230.93	$263.57
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	31	$38.71	$64.29	$103.00
2	528A6	Bath, NY	73	$0.00	$27.30	$27.30
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	47	$49.34	$226.15	$275.49
2	528A8	Albany, NY	91	$13.19	$188.97	$202.15
3	526	Bronx, NY	126	$23.33	$238.79	$262.13
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	36	$113.89	$235.92	$349.81
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	190	$2.11	$77.55	$79.66
3	620	Montrose, NY	131	$1.72	$70.12	$71.84
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	71	$14.08	$351.97	$366.06
3	632	Northport, NY	80	$21.28	$323.78	$345.05
4	529	Butler, PA	45	$6.67	$108.64	$115.31
4	542	Coatesville, PA	277	$17.83	$101.87	$119.70
4	595	Lebanon, PA	72	$0.00	$56.51	$56.51
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	134	$22.76	$162.60	$185.37
5	512	Baltimore, MD	49	$4.08	$235.33	$239.41
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	39	$1.54	$130.33	$131.87
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	111	$0.00	$191.65	$191.65
5	688	Washington, DC	92	$10.91	$296.38	$307.29
6	590	Hampton, VA	64	$14.84	$102.27	$117.11
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	$244.17	$183.25	$427.42
6	652	Richmond, VA	19	$34.74	$213.79	$248.53
6	658	Salem, VA	73	$79.81	$83.26	$163.07
7	508	Atlanta, GA	136	$77.71	$98.63	$176.33
7	509	Augusta, GA	88	$63.56	$357.84	$421.40
7	534	Charleston, SC	33	$87.52	$129.18	$216.70
7	544	Columbia, SC	186	$109.56	$202.58	$312.14
7	557	Dublin, GA	52	$0.00	$43.17	$43.17
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	138	$0.00	$180.38	$180.38
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	127	$42.46	$239.69	$282.16
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	82	$4.88	$86.30	$91.18
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	85	$19.08	$72.44	$91.52
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	58	$50.90	$196.97	$247.86
8	673	Tampa, FL	111	$10.45	$96.26	$106.71
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	63	$15.87	$64.14	$80.02
9	596	Lexington, KY	19	$169.95	$156.21	$326.16
9	603	Louisville, KY	15	$8.93	$423.93	$432.87
9	614	Memphis, TN	49	$93.78	$309.47	$403.24
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	93	$0.00	$16.73	$16.73
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	48	$18.75	$74.98	$93.73
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	157	$61.13	$123.22	$184.34
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	169	$45.89	$142.34	$188.24
10	541	Cleveland, OH	193	$14.79	$107.76	$122.54
10	552	Dayton, OH	25	$8.48	$78.40	$86.88

Table 21 cont. Income in the 30 Days Prior to Admission by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Mean Employment Income (month prior to admission) $	Mean Other Income†† (month prior to admission) $	Mean Total Income $
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	37	$14.59	$229.11	$243.70
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	52	$19.27	$103.44	$122.71
11	550	Danville, IL	32	$52.34	$127.50	$179.84
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	$60.70	$231.91	$292.61
12	556	North Chicago, IL	166	$15.51	$92.36	$107.87
12	578	Hines, IL	25	$86.28	$307.04	$393.32
12	607	Madison, WI	32	$7.47	$422.56	$430.03
12	676	Tomah, WI	65	$14.97	$336.69	$351.66
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	38	$76.55	$201.97	$278.53
15	589	Kansas City, MO	87	$22.39	$58.38	$80.77
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	29	$95.28	$225.62	$320.90
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	48	$6.25	$65.10	$71.35
16	520	Biloxi, MS	124	$18.97	$78.13	$97.10
16	580	Houston, TX	222	$19.51	$163.64	$183.15
16	586	Jackson, MS	43	$131.15	$185.04	$316.19
16	598	Little Rock, AR	125	$18.22	$66.26	$84.49
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	59	$6.66	$132.46	$139.12
17	549	Dallas, TX	91	$15.35	$169.76	$185.11
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	45	$0.89	$74.47	$75.36
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	$137.10	$295.65	$432.76
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX	325	$47.89	$196.22	$244.12
17	671	San Antonio, TX	41	$43.90	$124.73	$168.63
17	674	Temple, TX	207	$51.70	$128.78	$180.48
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	54	$154.76	$137.28	$292.04
18	649	Prescott, AZ	83	$45.93	$117.87	$163.80
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	$24.04	$125.46	$149.50
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	31	$21.13	$97.55	$118.68
19	666	Sheridan, WY	16	$9.31	$147.19	$156.50
20	463	Anchorage, AK	48	$19.79	$212.71	$232.50
20	648	Portland, OR	72	$51.83	$120.72	$172.56
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	115	$73.06	$224.61	$297.67
20	692	White City, OR	171	$18.71	$100.41	$119.12
21	459	Honolulu, HI	12	$25.00	$585.00	$610.00
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	80	$10.00	$169.49	$179.49
21	654	Reno, NV	14	$0.00	$587.36	$587.36
21	662	San Francisco, CA	63	$6.65	$532.27	$538.92
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	$44.10	$436.87	$480.97
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	92	$8.70	$548.08	$556.77
22	664	San Diego, CA	23	$34.78	$612.65	$647.43
23	437	Fargo, ND	16	$6.25	$202.88	$209.13
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	40	$18.50	$248.80	$267.30
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	118	$0.00	$115.70	$115.70
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	56	$0.00	$290.93	$290.93
23	636	Omaha, NE	18	$69.44	$166.61	$236.06
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	223	$43.06	$392.70	$435.76
VETERANS AVERAGE (N=8,078)				**$34.62**	**$193.74**	**$228.36**
SITE AVERAGE (N=96)				**$37.14**	**$213.13**	**$250.27**
SITE S.D.				**$42.26**	**$153.46**	**$161.05**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY05: VISN 1, Togus; VISN 10, Columbus; VISN 15, Poplar Bluff; VISN 18, El Paso; and VISN 19, Colorado Springs.

†† Mean other income includes service connected disability compensation, non-service connected pension, SSDI, SSI, Social Security Retirement, other disability (e.g. workman's compensation) and any other public support (e.g. food stamps, general relief).

Table 22. Usual Residence in Month Prior to CWT/VI Admission by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Housed†† %	Transitional Housing or Halfway House %	Hospital, Nursing Home or Domiciliary %	Outdoors / Shelter %	Other %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	27	85.2%	0.0%	11.1%	3.7%	0.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	258	17.8%	9.3%	42.2%	27.1%	3.5%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	8.0%	24.0%	64.0%	4.0%	0.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	119	31.9%	5.9%	29.4%	28.6%	4.2%
1	631	Northampton, MA	126	47.6%	7.9%	5.6%	36.5%	2.4%
1	650	Providence, RI	79	73.4%	15.2%	2.5%	8.9%	0.0%
1	689	West Haven, CT	24	45.8%	12.5%	8.3%	33.3%	0.0%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	100	78.0%	5.0%	4.0%	11.0%	2.0%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	31	25.8%	0.0%	74.2%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	73	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	47	55.3%	14.9%	21.3%	6.4%	2.1%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	91	30.8%	17.6%	34.1%	14.3%	3.3%
3	526	Bronx, NY	126	47.6%	22.2%	1.6%	22.2%	6.3%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	36	77.8%	11.1%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	190	9.5%	6.8%	77.4%	5.8%	0.5%
3	620	Montrose, NY	131	21.4%	1.5%	62.6%	11.5%	3.1%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	71	35.2%	9.9%	28.2%	26.8%	0.0%
3	632	Northport, NY	80	42.5%	15.0%	11.3%	25.0%	6.3%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	4.4%	4.4%	91.1%	0.0%	0.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	277	54.2%	1.8%	1.4%	41.5%	1.1%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	72	4.2%	0.0%	93.1%	1.4%	1.4%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	134	41.0%	9.0%	44.8%	4.5%	0.7%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	49	63.3%	16.3%	6.1%	12.2%	2.0%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	39	33.3%	0.0%	35.9%	28.2%	2.6%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	111	13.5%	4.5%	80.2%	1.8%	0.0%
5	688	Washington, DC	92	42.4%	19.6%	5.4%	31.5%	1.1%
6	590	Hampton, VA	64	9.4%	0.0%	85.9%	4.7%	0.0%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	4.2%	8.3%	25.0%	62.5%	0.0%
6	652	Richmond, VA	19	63.2%	15.8%	0.0%	21.1%	0.0%
6	658	Salem, VA	73	46.6%	2.7%	13.7%	32.9%	4.1%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	136	21.3%	71.3%	0.0%	7.4%	0.0%
7	509	Augusta, GA	88	50.0%	19.3%	18.2%	12.5%	0.0%
7	534	Charleston, SC	33	12.1%	81.8%	0.0%	6.1%	0.0%
7	544	Columbia, SC	186	48.9%	10.2%	2.2%	34.4%	4.3%
7	557	Dublin, GA	52	1.9%	0.0%	96.2%	1.9%	0.0%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	138	62.3%	2.2%	5.1%	30.4%	0.0%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	127	69.3%	12.6%	0.0%	17.3%	0.8%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	82	19.5%	11.0%	62.2%	6.1%	1.2%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	85	12.9%	87.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	58	41.4%	29.3%	6.9%	20.7%	1.7%
8	673	Tampa, FL	111	25.2%	53.2%	0.0%	21.6%	0.0%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	63	41.3%	6.3%	0.0%	52.4%	0.0%
9	596	Lexington, KY	19	63.2%	21.1%	5.3%	5.3%	5.3%
9	603	Louisville, KY	15	20.0%	73.3%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	49	38.8%	57.1%	2.0%	2.0%	0.0%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	93	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	48	70.8%	14.6%	2.1%	12.5%	0.0%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	157	59.2%	3.2%	12.1%	15.9%	9.6%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	169	45.6%	16.6%	19.5%	17.8%	0.6%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	193	30.6%	2.6%	48.2%	18.7%	0.0%
10	552	Dayton, OH	25	44.0%	0.0%	48.0%	8.0%	0.0%
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	37	70.3%	5.4%	0.0%	21.6%	2.7%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	52	57.7%	7.7%	13.5%	19.2%	1.9%
11	550	Danville, IL	32	46.9%	3.1%	3.1%	43.8%	3.1%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	50.0%	37.0%	0.0%	13.0%	0.0%

Table 22 cont. Usual Residence in Month Prior to CWT/VI Admission by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Housed†† %	Transitional Housing or Halfway House %	Hospital, Nursing Home or Domiciliary %	Outdoors / Shelter %	Other %
12	556	North Chicago, IL	166	15.1%	10.2%	69.3%	3.6%	1.8%
12	578	Hines, IL	25	76.0%	16.0%	0.0%	8.0%	0.0%
12	607	Madison, WI	32	34.4%	65.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12	676	Tomah, WI	65	27.7%	47.7%	20.0%	3.1%	1.5%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	38	28.9%	10.5%	60.5%	0.0%	0.0%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	87	31.0%	17.2%	37.9%	11.5%	2.3%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	29	27.6%	6.9%	44.8%	17.2%	3.4%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	48	4.2%	0.0%	95.8%	0.0%	0.0%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	124	25.0%	2.4%	47.6%	25.0%	0.0%
16	580	Houston, TX	222	48.2%	24.3%	0.5%	24.8%	2.3%
16	586	Jackson, MS	43	29.6%	55.6%	1.9%	13.0%	0.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	125	9.6%	11.2%	78.4%	0.8%	0.0%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	59	37.3%	25.4%	6.8%	27.1%	3.4%
17	549	Dallas, TX	91	50.5%	11.0%	15.4%	20.9%	2.2%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	45	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	37.9%	6.5%	0.8%	54.8%	0.0%
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX	325	28.0%	8.3%	1.8%	58.5%	3.4%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	41	51.2%	43.9%	0.0%	4.9%	0.0%
17	674	Temple, TX	207	25.1%	7.2%	45.9%	19.8%	1.9%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	54	38.9%	22.2%	7.4%	14.8%	16.7%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	83	8.4%	4.8%	86.7%	0.0%	0.0%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	26.9%	73.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	31	41.9%	38.7%	0.0%	19.4%	0.0%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	16	6.3%	0.0%	18.8%	75.0%	0.0%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	48	31.3%	8.3%	54.2%	0.0%	6.3%
20	648	Portland, OR	72	38.9%	27.8%	9.7%	22.2%	1.4%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	115	46.1%	9.6%	8.7%	35.7%	0.0%
20	692	White City, OR	171	4.7%	0.0%	94.7%	0.6%	0.0%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	12	66.7%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	80	15.0%	2.5%	60.0%	22.5%	0.0%
21	654	Reno, NV	14	71.4%	21.4%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	63	33.3%	54.0%	1.6%	11.1%	0.0%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	43.3%	40.0%	3.3%	13.3%	0.0%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	92	43.5%	41.3%	0.0%	15.2%	0.0%
22	664	San Diego, CA	23	73.9%	21.7%	0.0%	4.3%	0.0%
23	427	Fargo, ND	16	31.3%	6.3%	12.5%	50.0%	0.0%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	40	47.5%	7.5%	27.5%	17.5%	0.0%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	118	5.1%	0.8%	92.4%	1.7%	0.0%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	56	44.6%	37.5%	7.1%	10.7%	0.0%
23	636	Omaha, NE	18	50.0%	27.8%	11.1%	11.1%	0.0%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	223	64.1%	8.5%	6.7%	18.8%	1.8%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,078)				35.2%	14.9%	29.4%	18.9%	1.6%
SITE AVERAGE (N=96)				36.8%	18.1%	27.4%	16.2%	1.4%
SITE S.D.				21.5%	20.4%	32.6%	15.6%	2.5%

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY05: VISN 1, Togus; VISN 10, Columbus; VISN 15; Poplar Bluff; VISN 18, El Paso; and VISN 19, Colorado Springs.

†† Includes own apartment, room or house; apartment, room or house of friend or family member and hotel or SRO.

Table 23. Homeless When Last in Community and History of Job Loss Due to Substance Use by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Homeless When Last Living in the Community %	Any Job Lost Due to Substance Abuse %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	27	11.1%	44.4%
1	518	Bedford, MA	258	73.3%	53.1%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	84.0%	60.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	119	76.5%	65.5%
1	631	Northampton, MA	126	60.3%	60.3%
1	650	Providence, RI	79	32.9%	34.2%
1	689	West Haven, CT	24	41.7%	29.2%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	100	37.0%	42.0%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	31	41.9%	54.8%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	73	68.5%	75.3%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	47	46.8%	48.9%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	91	63.7%	51.6%
3	526	Bronx, NY	126	39.7%	37.3%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	36	52.8%	42.9%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	190	98.4%	41.1%
3	620	Montrose, NY	131	48.1%	55.7%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	71	70.4%	62.0%
3	632	Northport, NY	80	73.8%	51.3%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	55.6%	73.3%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	277	88.1%	61.4%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	72	62.5%	76.4%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	134	52.2%	53.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	49	34.7%	57.1%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	39	61.5%	74.4%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	111	75.7%	53.2%
5	688	Washington, DC	92	58.7%	38.0%
6	590	Hampton, VA	64	67.2%	64.1%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	87.5%	62.5%
6	652	Richmond, VA	19	47.4%	36.8%
6	658	Salem, VA	73	60.3%	54.8%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	136	83.1%	63.2%
7	509	Augusta, GA	88	50.0%	33.0%
7	534	Charleston, SC	33	63.6%	69.7%
7	544	Columbia, SC	186	81.7%	28.5%
7	557	Dublin, GA	52	98.1%	36.5%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	138	78.3%	30.4%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	127	55.9%	47.2%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	82	65.9%	51.2%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	85	2.4%	20.0%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	58	63.8%	69.0%
8	673	Tampa, FL	111	70.3%	39.6%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	63	100.0%	57.1%
9	596	Lexington, KY	19	26.3%	47.4%
9	603	Louisville, KY	15	80.0%	53.3%
9	614	Memphis, TN	49	36.7%	49.0%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	93	69.9%	66.7%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	48	77.1%	91.7%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	157	74.5%	73.9%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	169	71.0%	79.3%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	193	65.8%	57.0%
10	552	Dayton, OH	25	60.0%	56.0%

Table 23 cont. Homeless When Last in Community and History of Job Loss Due to Substance Use by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Homeless When Last Living in the Community %	Any Job Lost Due to Substance Abuse %
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	37	45.9%	27.0%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	52	57.7%	73.1%
11	550	Danville, IL	32	71.9%	62.5%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	28.3%	50.0%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	166	69.3%	71.7%
12	578	Hines, IL	25	52.0%	48.0%
12	607	Madison, WI	32	31.3%	65.6%
12	676	Tomah, WI	65	40.0%	58.5%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	38	57.9%	68.4%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	87	56.3%	90.8%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	29	55.2%	65.5%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	48	60.4%	100.0%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	124	77.4%	60.5%
16	580	Houston, TX	222	48.2%	44.1%
16	586	Jackson, MS	43	72.2%	70.4%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	125	28.8%	72.0%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	59	76.3%	62.7%
17	549	Dallas, TX	91	67.0%	60.4%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	45	77.8%	60.0%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	82.3%	52.4%
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX	325	75.7%	72.6%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	41	61.0%	51.2%
17	674	Temple, TX	207	74.9%	36.7%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	54	75.9%	50.9%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	83	59.0%	57.8%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	44.2%	92.3%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	31	61.3%	48.4%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	16	68.8%	87.5%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	48	81.3%	77.1%
20	648	Portland, OR	72	58.3%	44.4%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	115	74.8%	47.0%
20	692	White City, OR	171	76.6%	60.2%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	12	16.7%	25.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	80	76.3%	56.3%
21	654	Reno, NV	14	7.1%	35.7%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	63	69.8%	55.6%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	50.0%	30.0%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	92	55.4%	75.0%
22	664	San Diego, CA	23	17.4%	52.2%
23	437	Fargo, ND	16	68.8%	50.0%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	40	17.5%	77.5%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	118	74.6%	67.8%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	56	64.3%	58.9%
23	636	Omaha, NE	18	16.7%	44.4%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	223	48.0%	53.8%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,078)				**64.4%**	**56.3%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=96)				**59.3%**	**56.3%**
SITE S.D.				**20.4%**	**15.9%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY05: VISN 1, Togus; VISN 10, Columbus; VISN 15, Poplar Bluff; VISN 18, El Paso; and VISN 19, Colorado Springs.

Table 24. Clinical Psychiatric Diagnoses at Admission by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Alcohol Abuse / Dependency %	Drug Abuse/ Dependency %	Any Substance Abuse / Dependency %	Serious Mental Illness †† %	Dually Diagnosed ††† %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	27	59.3%	33.3%	63.0%	88.9%	51.9%
1	518	Bedford, MA	258	77.5%	50.8%	83.3%	73.6%	63.2%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	80.0%	76.0%	96.0%	80.0%	76.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	119	88.2%	64.7%	94.1%	68.1%	63.0%
1	631	Northampton, MA	126	85.7%	52.4%	90.5%	46.0%	39.7%
1	650	Providence, RI	79	51.9%	34.2%	59.5%	83.5%	46.8%
1	689	West Haven, CT	24	58.3%	45.8%	66.7%	66.7%	50.0%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	100	59.0%	49.0%	70.0%	57.0%	40.0%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	31	67.7%	64.5%	74.2%	58.1%	45.2%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	73	89.0%	76.7%	100.0%	49.3%	49.3%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	47	61.7%	53.2%	72.3%	51.1%	34.0%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	91	69.2%	57.1%	78.0%	57.1%	42.9%
3	526	Bronx, NY	126	54.0%	70.6%	78.6%	48.4%	37.3%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	36	44.4%	86.1%	94.4%	**25.0%**	19.4%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	190	72.6%	70.0%	91.6%	**28.9%**	26.8%
3	620	Montrose, NY	131	81.7%	83.2%	95.4%	40.5%	37.4%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	71	73.2%	78.9%	90.1%	71.8%	62.0%
3	632	Northport, NY	80	68.8%	58.8%	85.0%	55.0%	43.8%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	82.2%	73.3%	95.6%	60.0%	55.6%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	277	67.5%	73.3%	93.1%	50.9%	46.6%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	72	84.7%	80.6%	100.0%	**34.7%**	34.7%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	134	65.7%	69.4%	89.6%	**36.6%**	32.1%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	49	53.1%	71.4%	85.7%	57.1%	44.9%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	39	66.7%	48.7%	79.5%	66.7%	46.2%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	111	76.6%	74.8%	87.4%	61.3%	55.0%
5	688	Washington, DC	92	46.7%	54.3%	76.1%	44.6%	34.8%
6	590	Hampton, VA	64	87.5%	87.5%	100.0%	**35.9%**	35.9%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	75.0%	45.8%	91.7%	50.0%	41.7%
6	652	Richmond, VA	19	73.7%	84.2%	100.0%	68.4%	68.4%
6	658	Salem, VA	73	82.2%	67.1%	93.2%	**34.2%**	31.5%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	136	72.1%	79.4%	97.1%	47.1%	44.9%
7	509	Augusta, GA	88	64.8%	55.7%	78.4%	72.7%	53.4%
7	534	Charleston, SC	33	97.0%	78.8%	100.0%	42.4%	42.4%
7	544	Columbia, SC	186	55.7%	53.8%	73.1%	51.6%	29.6%
7	557	Dublin, GA	52	42.3%	44.2%	51.9%	44.2%	26.9%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	138	65.2%	69.6%	81.9%	70.3%	55.1%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	127	74.8%	67.7%	89.8%	61.4%	54.3%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	82	74.4%	41.5%	82.9%	45.1%	37.8%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	85	83.5%	70.6%	94.1%	**35.3%**	30.6%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	58	81.0%	53.4%	84.5%	48.3%	34.5%
8	673	Tampa, FL	111	88.3%	72.1%	94.6%	**28.8%**	26.1%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	63	74.6%	81.0%	96.8%	**7.9%**	6.3%
9	596	Lexington, KY	19	73.7%	42.1%	84.2%	47.4%	31.6%
9	603	Louisville, KY	15	86.7%	80.0%	93.3%	53.3%	46.7%
9	614	Memphis, TN	49	61.2%	63.3%	79.6%	40.8%	30.6%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	93	81.7%	50.5%	87.1%	59.1%	51.6%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	48	93.8%	72.9%	93.8%	58.3%	52.1%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	157	80.3%	70.1%	85.4%	**34.4%**	26.8%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	169	91.7%	87.0%	97.0%	56.8%	55.0%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	193	81.9%	80.3%	92.7%	49.2%	43.5%
10	552	Dayton, OH	25	54.2%	64.0%	76.0%	**36.0%**	28.0%
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	37	54.1%	45.9%	70.3%	70.3%	43.2%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	52	73.1%	63.5%	88.5%	59.6%	50.0%
11	550	Danville, IL	32	68.8%	62.5%	93.8%	53.1%	53.1%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	63.0%	63.0%	80.4%	65.2%	50.0%

Table 24 cont. Clinical Psychiatric Diagnoses at Admission by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Alcohol Abuse / Dependency %	Drug Abuse/ Dependency %	Any Substance Abuse / Dependency %	Serious Mental Illness †† %	Dually Diagnosed ††† %
12	556	North Chicago, IL	166	75.9%	70.5%	95.2%	**34.3%**	31.3%
12	578	Hines, IL	25	64.0%	76.0%	88.0%	48.0%	40.0%
12	607	Madison, WI	32	81.3%	59.4%	87.5%	81.3%	68.8%
12	676	Tomah, WI	65	86.2%	50.8%	87.7%	78.5%	70.8%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	38	89.5%	76.3%	94.7%	60.5%	57.9%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	87	86.2%	73.6%	95.4%	66.7%	63.2%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	29	79.3%	34.5%	89.7%	41.4%	34.5%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	48	95.8%	95.8%	97.9%	72.9%	70.8%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	124	68.5%	57.3%	82.3%	55.6%	49.2%
16	580	Houston, TX	222	57.2%	70.3%	82.9%	52.3%	37.4%
16	586	Jackson, MS	43	75.9%	64.8%	88.9%	50.0%	40.7%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	125	87.2%	83.2%	95.2%	**29.6%**	25.6%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	59	66.1%	49.2%	76.3%	72.9%	55.9%
17	549	Dallas, TX	91	76.9%	78.0%	84.6%	61.5%	48.4%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	45	75.6%	77.8%	97.8%	46.7%	46.7%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	65.3%	77.4%	82.3%	**35.5%**	25.8%
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX	325	79.4%	75.1%	90.2%	53.5%	47.1%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	41	68.3%	46.3%	78.0%	48.8%	29.3%
17	674	Temple, TX	207	63.3%	46.4%	72.0%	59.4%	41.1%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	54	61.1%	27.8%	74.1%	64.8%	42.6%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	83	78.3%	45.8%	88.0%	62.7%	54.2%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	84.6%	61.5%	92.3%	44.2%	40.4%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	31	71.0%	32.3%	80.6%	74.2%	61.3%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	16	93.8%	62.5%	93.8%	68.8%	62.5%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	48	81.3%	52.1%	89.6%	60.4%	54.2%
20	648	Portland, OR	72	58.3%	40.3%	70.8%	65.3%	43.1%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	115	46.1%	36.5%	61.7%	67.0%	37.4%
20	692	White City, OR	171	85.4%	70.2%	93.6%	71.3%	67.3%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	12	50.0%	50.0%	66.7%	50.0%	25.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	80	72.5%	73.8%	88.8%	**32.5%**	25.0%
21	654	Reno, NV	14	64.3%	35.7%	64.3%	92.9%	57.1%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	63	68.3%	61.9%	87.3%	65.1%	57.1%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	56.7%	53.3%	70.0%	**36.7%**	20.0%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	92	84.8%	73.9%	97.8%	47.8%	45.7%
22	664	San Diego, CA	23	73.9%	52.2%	82.6%	78.3%	65.2%
23	427	Fargo, ND	16	68.8%	31.3%	75.0%	43.8%	37.5%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	40	95.0%	35.0%	95.0%	55.0%	52.5%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	118	89.0%	48.3%	95.8%	65.3%	61.9%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	56	71.4%	33.9%	80.4%	62.5%	44.6%
23	636	Omaha, NE	18	66.7%	77.8%	83.3%	83.3%	66.7%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	223	78.5%	64.1%	90.6%	57.0%	48.0%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,078)				73.3%	64.4%	86.6%	53.4%	44.2%
SITE AVERAGE (N=96)				72.7%	61.8%	85.5%	55.1%	44.9%
SITE S.D.				12.6%	15.7%	10.4%	15.4%	13.4%

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY05: VISN 1, Togus; VISN 10, Columbus; VISN 15, Poplar Bluff; VISN 18, El Paso; and VISN 19, Colorado Springs.

†† Serious mental illness is defined as having a psychiatric diagnosis that falls into one of the following categories: schizophrenia, other psychotic disorder, affective disorder, bipolar disorder, PTSD and other anxiety disorders.

††† Dual Diagnosis is defined as having both a substance abuse disorder and a serious psychiatric disorder.

Table 25. Presence of a Psychiatric Disorder or Disabling Medical Condition by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Any Psychiatric Disorder†† %	Any Disabling Medical Condition %	Any Psychiatric Disorder or Disabling Medical Condition %
1	405	**White River Junction, VT**	27	100.0%	37.0%	100.0%
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	258	96.9%	55.4%	100.0%
1	523	**Boston, MA**	25	100.0%	60.0%	100.0%
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	119	100.0%	56.3%	100.0%
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	126	97.6%	76.2%	100.0%
1	650	**Providence, RI**	79	98.7%	81.0%	100.0%
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	24	91.7%	54.2%	100.0%
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	100	94.0%	71.0%	100.0%
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	31	87.1%	58.1%	100.0%
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	73	100.0%	65.8%	100.0%
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	47	93.6%	72.3%	100.0%
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	91	94.5%	53.8%	100.0%
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	126	100.0%	51.6%	100.0%
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**	36	100.0%	30.6%	100.0%
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	190	94.7%	25.3%	95.8%
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	131	99.2%	33.6%	99.2%
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	71	100.0%	45.1%	100.0%
3	632	**Northport, NY**	80	100.0%	56.3%	100.0%
4	529	**Butler, PA**	45	100.0%	57.8%	100.0%
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	277	99.6%	48.4%	100.0%
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	72	100.0%	9.7%	100.0%
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	134	96.3%	72.4%	100.0%
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	49	98.0%	69.4%	100.0%
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	39	100.0%	51.3%	100.0%
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	111	97.3%	84.7%	100.0%
5	688	**Washington, DC**	92	85.9%	60.9%	100.0%
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	64	100.0%	56.3%	100.0%
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	24	100.0%	70.8%	100.0%
6	652	**Richmond, VA**	19	100.0%	89.5%	100.0%
6	658	**Salem, VA**	73	98.6%	39.7%	100.0%
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	136	100.0%	63.2%	100.0%
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	88	97.7%	96.6%	100.0%
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	33	100.0%	45.5%	100.0%
7	544	**Columbia, SC**	186	98.4%	67.2%	100.0%
7	557	**Dublin, GA**	52	73.1%	73.1%	88.5%
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	138	97.8%	65.2%	100.0%
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	127	98.4%	63.0%	100.0%
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	82	90.2%	64.6%	98.8%
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	85	98.8%	62.4%	100.0%
8	573	**Gainesville/Lake City, FL**	58	98.3%	41.4%	100.0%
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	111	97.3%	60.4%	100.0%
8	673OR	**Orlando, FL**	63	100.0%	4.8%	100.0%
9	596	**Lexington, KY**	19	100.0%	31.6%	100.0%
9	603	**Louisville, KY**	15	100.0%	86.7%	100.0%
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	49	93.9%	34.7%	100.0%
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	93	94.6%	88.2%	100.0%
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	48	100.0%	79.2%	100.0%
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	157	96.2%	66.2%	100.0%
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	169	99.4%	75.7%	100.0%
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	193	100.0%	28.5%	100.0%
10	552	**Dayton, OH**	25	88.0%	56.0%	96.0%

Table 25 cont. Presence of a Psychiatric Disorder or Disabling Medical Condition by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Any Psychiatric Disorder†† %	Any Disabling Medical Condition %	Any Psychiatric Disorder or Disabling Medical Condition %
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	37	100.0%	75.7%	100.0%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	52	98.1%	50.0%	100.0%
11	550	Danville, IL	32	93.8%	50.0%	100.0%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	95.7%	84.8%	100.0%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	166	99.4%	57.2%	100.0%
12	578	Hines, IL	25	96.0%	64.0%	96.0%
12	607	Madison, WI	32	100.0%	93.8%	100.0%
12	676	Tomah, WI	65	100.0%	89.2%	100.0%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	38	97.4%	55.3%	100.0%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	87	98.9%	28.7%	100.0%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	29	96.6%	20.7%	100.0%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	48	100.0%	77.1%	100.0%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	124	93.5%	58.1%	98.4%
16	580	Houston, TX	222	100.0%	67.1%	100.0%
16	586	Jackson, MS	43	100.0%	77.8%	100.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	125	100.0%	14.4%	100.0%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	59	94.9%	88.1%	100.0%
17	549	Dallas, TX	91	97.8%	68.1%	100.0%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	45	97.8%	51.1%	100.0%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	96.8%	54.0%	100.0%
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX	325	97.8%	76.6%	99.7%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	41	97.6%	51.2%	100.0%
17	674	Temple, TX	207	92.3%	85.5%	100.0%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	54	96.3%	72.2%	100.0%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	83	97.6%	100.0%	100.0%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	96.2%	75.0%	100.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	31	93.5%	64.5%	100.0%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	16	100.0%	62.5%	100.0%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	48	95.8%	64.6%	97.9%
20	648	Portland, OR	72	93.1%	55.6%	100.0%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	115	93.0%	78.3%	99.1%
20	692	White City, OR	171	98.2%	81.3%	100.0%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	12	100.0%	58.3%	100.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	80	98.8%	60.0%	98.8%
21	654	Reno, NV	14	100.0%	92.9%	100.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	63	98.4%	65.1%	100.0%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	90.0%	53.3%	100.0%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	92	100.0%	46.7%	100.0%
22	664	San Diego, CA	23	95.7%	82.6%	100.0%
23	437	Fargo, ND	16	87.5%	31.3%	100.0%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	40	97.5%	52.5%	100.0%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	118	99.2%	94.1%	100.0%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	56	98.2%	62.5%	100.0%
23	636	Omaha, NE	18	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	223	99.6%	46.6%	100.0%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,078)				**97.4%**	**60.9%**	**99.7%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=96)				**97.1%**	**61.0%**	**99.7%**
SITE S.D.				**4.1%**	**19.6%**	**1.4%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY05:   VISN 1, Togus; VISN 10, Columbus; VISN 15, Poplar Bluff; VISN 18, El Paso; and VISN 19, Colorado Springs.

†† Includes substance abuse disorders.

Table 26. Self-Reported Lifetime Hospitalizations for Mental Health Problems by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Ever Hospitalized for Alcohol Problems %	Ever Hospitalized for Drug Problems %	Ever Hospitalized for Psychiatric Problems %	Ever Hospitalized for Any Mental Health Problem %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	27	55.6%	37.0%	70.4%	88.9%
1	518	Bedford, MA	258	72.9%	41.5%	46.9%	87.6%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	72.0%	72.0%	36.0%	100.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	119	84.9%	65.5%	53.8%	97.5%
1	631	Northampton, MA	126	74.6%	49.2%	40.5%	88.9%
1	650	Providence, RI	79	51.9%	36.7%	77.2%	94.9%
1	689	West Haven, CT	24	54.2%	45.8%	66.7%	83.3%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	100	51.0%	44.0%	27.0%	68.0%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	31	74.2%	71.0%	38.7%	83.9%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	73	67.1%	57.5%	27.4%	83.6%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	47	40.4%	51.1%	27.7%	61.7%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	91	74.7%	62.6%	50.5%	91.2%
3	526	Bronx, NY	126	39.7%	57.9%	29.4%	70.6%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	36	44.4%	75.0%	27.8%	86.1%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	190	62.1%	65.8%	35.8%	84.2%
3	620	Montrose, NY	131	81.7%	80.2%	22.1%	92.4%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	71	70.4%	64.8%	62.0%	80.3%
3	632	Northport, NY	80	63.8%	52.5%	35.0%	82.5%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	91.1%	80.0%	40.0%	100.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	277	59.9%	69.7%	37.5%	85.9%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	72	77.8%	73.6%	26.4%	95.8%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	134	67.9%	64.9%	44.0%	90.3%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	49	53.1%	51.0%	53.1%	83.7%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	39	76.9%	64.1%	71.8%	97.4%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	111	74.8%	68.5%	42.3%	89.2%
5	688	Washington, DC	92	30.4%	32.6%	38.0%	59.8%
6	590	Hampton, VA	64	82.8%	85.9%	34.4%	95.3%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	79.2%	58.3%	41.7%	91.7%
6	652	Richmond, VA	19	52.6%	73.7%	57.9%	94.7%
6	658	Salem, VA	73	80.8%	68.5%	43.8%	97.3%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	136	33.8%	35.3%	27.2%	53.7%
7	509	Augusta, GA	88	59.1%	55.7%	56.8%	84.1%
7	534	Charleston, SC	33	54.5%	42.4%	30.3%	60.6%
7	544	Columbia, SC	186	24.2%	23.1%	16.7%	33.3%
7	557	Dublin, GA	52	63.5%	59.6%	38.5%	78.8%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	138	68.8%	68.8%	65.9%	92.8%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	127	74.0%	58.3%	62.2%	92.9%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	82	70.7%	47.6%	32.9%	85.4%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	85	42.4%	32.9%	14.1%	52.9%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	58	81.0%	51.7%	36.2%	89.7%
8	673	Tampa, FL	111	32.4%	21.6%	13.5%	44.1%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	63	49.2%	42.9%	22.2%	63.5%
9	596	Lexington, KY	19	63.2%	36.8%	47.4%	89.5%
9	603	Louisville, KY	15	86.7%	60.0%	26.7%	86.7%
9	614	Memphis, TN	49	59.2%	55.1%	40.8%	75.5%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	93	75.3%	43.0%	32.3%	83.9%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	48	70.8%	54.2%	58.3%	85.4%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	157	66.9%	55.4%	27.4%	82.8%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	169	88.8%	84.0%	36.1%	94.7%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	193	83.4%	81.3%	51.8%	98.4%
10	552	Dayton, OH	25	56.0%	56.0%	32.0%	80.0%

Table 26 cont. Self-Reported Lifetime Hospitalizations for Mental Health Problems by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Ever Hospitalized for Alcohol Problems %	Ever Hospitalized for Drug Problems %	Ever Hospitalized for Psychiatric Problems %	Ever Hospitalized for Any Mental Health Problem %
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	37	37.8%	16.2%	37.8%	56.8%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	52	69.2%	55.8%	36.5%	88.5%
11	550	Danville, IL	32	50.0%	43.8%	46.9%	68.8%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	28.3%	23.9%	32.6%	56.5%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	166	77.1%	70.5%	44.0%	99.4%
12	578	Hines, IL	25	48.0%	64.0%	56.0%	84.0%
12	607	Madison, WI	32	78.1%	59.4%	62.5%	96.9%
12	676	Tomah, WI	65	84.6%	43.1%	58.5%	90.8%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	38	76.3%	63.2%	39.5%	86.8%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	87	86.2%	78.2%	64.4%	96.6%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	29	62.1%	34.5%	48.3%	79.3%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	48	95.8%	95.8%	62.5%	97.9%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	124	62.1%	50.0%	33.1%	82.3%
16	580	Houston, TX	222	31.5%	41.9%	32.4%	60.8%
16	586	Jackson, MS	43	70.4%	55.6%	38.9%	79.6%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	125	87.2%	76.0%	20.0%	97.6%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	59	57.6%	39.0%	35.6%	72.9%
17	549	Dallas, TX	91	54.9%	58.2%	48.4%	71.4%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	45	44.4%	44.4%	37.8%	62.2%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	41.9%	43.5%	33.9%	65.3%
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX	325	58.5%	56.3%	38.2%	69.8%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	41	68.3%	53.7%	56.1%	90.2%
17	674	Temple, TX	207	58.0%	47.8%	36.2%	80.7%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	54	29.6%	22.2%	35.2%	53.7%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	83	77.1%	44.6%	59.0%	94.0%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	78.8%	57.7%	26.9%	88.5%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	31	54.8%	41.9%	41.9%	77.4%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	16	93.8%	62.5%	68.8%	100.0%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	48	72.9%	41.7%	43.8%	87.5%
20	648	Portland, OR	72	44.4%	30.6%	38.9%	65.3%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	115	48.7%	38.3%	33.0%	72.2%
20	692	White City, OR	171	80.7%	64.9%	65.5%	94.2%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	12	41.7%	33.3%	16.7%	58.3%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	80	67.5%	71.3%	30.0%	93.8%
21	654	Reno, NV	14	64.3%	35.7%	85.7%	100.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	63	47.6%	34.9%	38.1%	73.0%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	50.0%	46.7%	56.7%	76.7%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	92	62.0%	51.1%	44.6%	78.3%
22	664	San Diego, CA	23	52.2%	39.1%	43.5%	87.0%
23	437	Fargo, ND	16	75.0%	37.5%	37.5%	81.3%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	40	87.5%	35.0%	52.5%	90.0%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	118	89.8%	45.8%	66.9%	98.3%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	56	75.0%	39.3%	46.4%	89.3%
23	636	Omaha, NE	18	66.7%	72.2%	61.1%	94.4%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	223	83.0%	63.2%	53.8%	99.1%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,078)				**64.0%**	**54.8%**	**41.2%**	**81.7%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=96)				**63.9%**	**53.2%**	**42.9%**	**82.3%**
SITE S.D.				**16.9%**	**16.1%**	**14.8%**	**14.2%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY05: VISN 1, Togus; VISN 10, Columbus, VISN 15, Poplar Bluff; VISN 18, El Paso; and VISN 19, Colorado Springs.

Table 27. Self-Reported Legal History by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Never Been Arrested %	Arrested 1 Time %	Arrested 2-5 Times %	Arrested 6-10 Times %	Arrested More Than 10 Times %	Never Been in Jail/Prison %	Jail/Prison < 2 Weeks %	Jail/Prison 2 Weeks or More %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	27	44.4%	14.8%	22.2%	3.7%	14.8%	51.9%	25.9%	22.2%
1	518	Bedford, MA	258	19.8%	19.0%	32.3%	12.9%	16.1%	44.7%	11.0%	44.3%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	4.0%	24.0%	36.0%	20.0%	16.0%	40.0%	8.0%	52.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	119	28.6%	16.0%	32.8%	11.8%	10.9%	39.5%	20.2%	40.3%
1	631	Northampton, MA	126	19.8%	19.8%	34.9%	13.5%	11.9%	43.7%	19.8%	36.5%
1	650	Providence, RI	79	42.1%	22.4%	21.1%	9.2%	5.3%	56.6%	21.1%	22.4%
1	689	West Haven, CT	24	16.7%	20.8%	29.2%	12.5%	20.8%	37.5%	8.3%	54.2%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	100	25.0%	30.0%	31.0%	10.0%	4.0%	42.0%	14.0%	44.0%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	31	29.0%	22.6%	38.7%	9.7%	0.0%	38.7%	22.6%	38.7%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	73	21.9%	15.1%	38.4%	17.8%	6.8%	31.5%	15.1%	53.4%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	47	34.0%	17.0%	44.7%	0.0%	4.3%	44.7%	14.9%	40.4%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	91	28.6%	19.8%	36.3%	8.8%	6.6%	39.6%	15.4%	45.1%
3	526	Bronx, NY	126	22.2%	18.3%	40.5%	7.9%	11.1%	39.7%	8.7%	51.6%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	36	25.0%	16.7%	47.2%	8.3%	2.8%	38.9%	19.4%	41.7%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	190	48.4%	10.5%	26.8%	6.3%	7.9%	56.3%	10.5%	33.2%
3	620	Montrose, NY	131	30.5%	13.0%	42.0%	4.6%	9.9%	45.8%	10.7%	43.5%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	71	25.4%	15.5%	35.2%	18.3%	5.6%	50.7%	5.6%	43.7%
3	632	Northport, NY	80	34.2%	16.5%	31.6%	10.1%	7.6%	46.8%	16.5%	36.7%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	26.7%	15.6%	31.1%	17.8%	8.9%	40.0%	17.8%	42.2%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	277	27.4%	22.0%	42.2%	3.2%	5.1%	41.9%	17.0%	41.2%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	72	4.2%	15.3%	56.9%	12.5%	11.1%	12.5%	11.1%	76.4%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	134	12.7%	17.9%	44.0%	13.4%	11.9%	26.9%	11.2%	61.9%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	49	24.5%	16.3%	44.9%	12.2%	2.0%	46.9%	16.3%	36.7%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	39	12.8%	12.8%	56.4%	12.8%	5.1%	23.1%	23.1%	53.8%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	111	14.4%	20.7%	54.1%	9.0%	1.8%	22.5%	24.3%	53.2%
5	688	Washington, DC	92	27.2%	20.7%	39.1%	3.3%	9.8%	44.6%	5.4%	50.0%
6	590	Hampton, VA	64	12.5%	18.8%	45.3%	18.8%	4.7%	26.6%	14.1%	59.4%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	4.2%	12.5%	50.0%	8.3%	25.0%	12.5%	37.5%	50.0%
6	652	Richmond, VA	19	15.8%	10.5%	57.9%	15.8%	0.0%	21.1%	21.1%	57.9%
6	658	Salem, VA	73	23.3%	15.1%	30.1%	17.8%	13.7%	30.1%	21.9%	47.9%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	136	11.8%	11.8%	44.9%	16.9%	14.7%	14.0%	19.1%	66.9%
7	509	Augusta, GA	88	21.6%	15.9%	51.1%	6.8%	4.5%	28.4%	30.7%	40.9%
7	534	Charleston, SC	33	3.0%	21.2%	54.5%	9.1%	12.1%	3.0%	27.3%	69.7%
7	544	Columbia, SC	186	14.0%	17.2%	48.4%	11.8%	8.6%	20.4%	21.0%	58.6%
7	557	Dublin, GA	52	21.2%	9.6%	57.7%	7.7%	3.8%	27.5%	21.6%	51.0%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	138	18.1%	29.7%	40.6%	4.3%	7.2%	20.3%	36.2%	43.5%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	127	15.0%	14.2%	51.2%	7.9%	11.8%	28.3%	24.4%	47.2%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	82	18.3%	14.6%	43.9%	13.4%	9.8%	31.7%	12.2%	56.1%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	85	10.6%	8.2%	49.4%	21.2%	10.6%	57.1%	9.5%	33.3%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	58	19.0%	13.8%	41.4%	15.5%	10.3%	25.9%	25.9%	48.3%
8	673	Tampa, FL	111	15.3%	9.9%	51.4%	14.4%	9.0%	18.9%	14.4%	66.7%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	63	15.9%	9.5%	44.4%	20.6%	9.5%	25.4%	20.6%	54.0%
9	596	Lexington, KY	19	5.3%	5.3%	68.4%	15.8%	5.3%	15.8%	21.1%	63.2%
9	603	Louisville, KY	15	6.7%	26.7%	20.0%	26.7%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	60.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	49	16.3%	18.4%	44.9%	10.2%	10.2%	24.5%	26.5%	49.0%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	93	21.5%	24.7%	45.2%	3.2%	5.4%	30.1%	37.6%	32.3%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	48	8.5%	8.5%	70.2%	4.3%	8.5%	12.8%	23.4%	63.8%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	157	15.3%	16.6%	38.2%	17.2%	12.7%	24.2%	19.1%	56.7%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	169	8.3%	10.1%	45.6%	20.1%	16.0%	14.2%	21.3%	64.5%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	193	10.4%	14.0%	54.4%	9.8%	11.4%	15.0%	19.2%	65.8%
10	552	Dayton, OH	25	12.0%	12.0%	36.0%	16.0%	24.0%	20.0%	4.0%	76.0%

Table 27 cont. Self-Reported Legal History by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Never Been Arrested %	Arrested 1 Time %	Arrested 2-5 Times %	Arrested 6-10 Times %	Arrested More Than 10 Times %	Never Been in Jail/Prison %	Jail/Prison < 2 Weeks %	Jail/Prison 2 Weeks or More %
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	37	33.3%	16.7%	33.3%	16.7%	0.0%	36.1%	27.8%	36.1%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	52	11.5%	19.2%	50.0%	11.5%	7.7%	15.4%	28.8%	55.8%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	32	6.3%	12.5%	50.0%	15.6%	15.6%	9.4%	50.0%	40.6%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	46	21.7%	15.2%	50.0%	8.7%	4.3%	26.1%	23.9%	50.0%
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	166	23.5%	14.5%	41.6%	12.0%	8.4%	50.0%	12.7%	37.3%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	25	16.0%	28.0%	52.0%	4.0%	0.0%	52.0%	20.0%	28.0%
12	607	**Madison, WI**	32	15.6%	18.8%	28.1%	25.0%	12.5%	21.9%	37.5%	40.6%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	65	10.9%	12.5%	56.3%	6.3%	14.1%	18.8%	21.9%	59.4%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	38	13.9%	8.3%	50.0%	22.2%	5.6%	16.7%	30.6%	52.8%
15	589	**Kansas City, MO**	87	10.3%	6.9%	63.2%	12.6%	6.9%	12.6%	27.6%	59.8%
15	589A5	**Topeka, KS**	29	13.8%	20.7%	48.3%	3.4%	13.8%	31.0%	34.5%	34.5%
15	589A6	**Leavenworth, KS**	48	4.2%	6.3%	54.2%	12.5%	22.9%	45.8%	4.2%	50.0%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	124	14.5%	17.7%	51.6%	12.1%	4.0%	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	222	14.4%	20.7%	48.2%	9.5%	7.2%	18.0%	13.1%	68.9%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	43	7.4%	14.8%	50.0%	13.0%	14.8%	9.3%	38.9%	51.9%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	125	18.4%	21.6%	40.0%	12.0%	8.0%	20.8%	31.2%	48.0%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	59	6.8%	18.6%	49.2%	15.3%	10.2%	27.1%	16.9%	55.9%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	91	12.1%	7.7%	51.6%	12.1%	16.5%	15.4%	14.3%	70.3%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	45	6.7%	8.9%	60.0%	4.4%	20.0%	22.2%	11.1%	66.7%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	124	9.7%	12.1%	46.0%	19.4%	12.9%	15.3%	25.8%	58.9%
17	549DT	**Dallas (downtown), TX**	325	11.7%	15.1%	38.5%	16.3%	18.5%	16.3%	14.2%	69.5%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	41	7.3%	19.5%	41.5%	12.2%	19.5%	29.3%	14.6%	56.1%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	207	16.9%	14.0%	42.5%	12.1%	14.5%	20.8%	18.8%	60.4%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	54	14.8%	24.1%	44.4%	11.1%	5.6%	37.0%	20.4%	42.6%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	83	14.5%	19.3%	43.4%	9.6%	13.3%	16.9%	25.3%	57.8%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	52	19.2%	25.0%	44.2%	7.7%	3.8%	30.8%	13.5%	55.8%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	31	25.8%	6.5%	38.7%	12.9%	16.1%	29.0%	22.6%	48.4%
19	666	**Sheridan, WY**	16	0.0%	0.0%	62.5%	18.8%	18.8%	0.0%	31.3%	68.8%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	48	2.1%	8.3%	50.0%	8.3%	31.3%	10.4%	12.5%	77.1%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	72	20.8%	29.2%	34.7%	5.6%	9.7%	26.4%	36.1%	37.5%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	115	26.1%	15.7%	36.5%	17.4%	4.3%	32.2%	20.9%	47.0%
20	692	**White City, OR**	171	17.0%	14.6%	40.4%	11.1%	17.0%	27.5%	15.8%	56.7%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	12	27.3%	18.2%	36.4%	0.0%	18.2%	36.4%	27.3%	36.4%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	80	3.8%	18.8%	35.0%	16.3%	26.3%	11.3%	18.8%	70.0%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	14	35.7%	28.6%	35.7%	0.0%	0.0%	35.7%	21.4%	42.9%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	63	25.4%	15.9%	39.7%	12.7%	6.3%	34.9%	12.7%	52.4%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	30	13.3%	16.7%	40.0%	13.3%	16.7%	20.0%	16.7%	63.3%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	92	8.7%	15.2%	45.7%	14.1%	16.3%	16.3%	31.5%	52.2%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	23	30.4%	4.3%	39.1%	17.4%	8.7%	34.8%	13.0%	52.2%
23	437	**Fargo, ND**	16	31.3%	18.8%	37.5%	6.3%	6.3%	43.8%	6.3%	50.0%
23	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	40	7.5%	17.5%	40.0%	15.0%	20.0%	15.0%	35.0%	50.0%
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	118	11.0%	14.4%	35.6%	13.6%	25.4%	16.9%	22.9%	60.2%
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	56	14.3%	23.2%	51.8%	7.1%	3.6%	17.9%	30.4%	51.8%
23	636	**Omaha, NE**	18	16.7%	16.7%	50.0%	5.6%	11.1%	27.8%	16.7%	55.6%
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	223	19.3%	11.7%	48.0%	10.8%	10.3%	23.3%	22.0%	54.7%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,078)				**18.1%**	**16.3%**	**43.1%**	**11.7%**	**10.8%**	**28.5%**	**19.3%**	**52.3%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=96)				**17.6%**	**16.2%**	**43.7%**	**11.7%**	**10.8%**	**28.3%**	**20.4%**	**51.3%**
SITE S.D.				**9.6%**	**5.8%**	**9.6%**	**5.5%**	**6.5%**	**12.8%**	**8.7%**	**11.6%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY05: VISN 1, Togas; VISN 10, Columbus; VISN 15, Poplar Bluff; VISN 18, El Paso; and VISN 19, Colorado Springs.

Table 28. Type of Discharge from CWT/VI by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Mutually Agreed/Planned Discharge %	Failure to Comply with Program Requirements %	Left Before Planned Discharge %	Other†† %
1	405	**White River Junction, VT**	27	70.4%	18.5%	7.4%	3.7%
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	258	**32.6%**	15.5%	46.5%	5.4%
1	523	**Boston, MA**	25	64.0%	16.0%	12.0%	8.0%
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	119	60.5%	**29.4%**	6.7%	3.4%
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	126	51.6%	17.5%	23.8%	7.1%
1	650	**Providence, RI**	79	57.0%	17.7%	20.3%	5.1%
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	24	75.0%	0.0%	12.5%	12.5%
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	100	56.0%	12.0%	21.0%	11.0%
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	31	71.0%	12.9%	16.1%	0.0%
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	73	90.4%	8.2%	1.4%	0.0%
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	47	83.0%	12.8%	4.3%	0.0%
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	91	54.9%	20.9%	22.0%	2.2%
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	126	58.7%	20.6%	4.0%	16.7%
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**	36	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	190	93.2%	4.2%	0.5%	2.1%
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	131	58.8%	16.8%	20.6%	3.8%
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	71	**33.8%**	31.0%	31.0%	4.2%
3	632	**Northport, NY**	80	51.3%	22.5%	17.5%	8.8%
4	529	**Butler, PA**	45	71.1%	6.7%	22.2%	0.0%
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	277	**33.2%**	3.2%	60.6%	2.9%
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	72	70.8%	15.3%	13.9%	0.0%
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	134	38.1%	19.4%	32.1%	10.4%
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	49	85.7%	2.0%	8.2%	4.1%
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	39	74.4%	10.3%	15.4%	0.0%
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	111	58.6%	18.0%	18.0%	5.4%
5	688	**Washington, DC**	92	51.1%	10.9%	31.5%	6.5%
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	64	65.6%	**26.6%**	6.3%	1.6%
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	24	45.8%	16.7%	33.3%	4.2%
6	652	**Richmond, VA**	19	**21.1%**	**36.8%**	31.6%	10.5%
6	658	**Salem, VA**	73	60.3%	20.5%	17.8%	1.4%
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	136	56.6%	24.3%	16.2%	2.9%
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	88	65.9%	22.7%	9.1%	2.3%
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	33	69.7%	18.2%	9.1%	3.0%
7	544	**Columbia, SC**	186	**22.6%**	**32.8%**	33.3%	11.3%
7	557	**Dublin, GA**	52	63.5%	13.5%	23.1%	0.0%
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	138	68.8%	15.2%	13.8%	2.2%
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	127	66.9%	12.6%	11.0%	9.4%
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	82	68.3%	2.4%	22.0%	7.3%
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	85	65.9%	21.2%	8.2%	4.7%
8	573	**Gainesville/Lake City, FL**	58	55.2%	15.5%	20.7%	8.6%
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	111	46.8%	5.4%	46.8%	0.9%
8	673OR	**Orlando, FL**	63	77.8%	12.7%	9.5%	0.0%
9	596	**Lexington, KY**	19	**31.6%**	21.1%	36.8%	10.5%
9	603	**Louisville, KY**	15	46.7%	6.7%	26.7%	20.0%
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	49	65.3%	14.3%	20.4%	0.0%
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	93	41.9%	**30.1%**	22.6%	5.4%
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	48	56.3%	18.8%	22.9%	2.1%
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	157	75.8%	4.5%	10.8%	8.9%
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	169	42.6%	**29.6%**	20.1%	7.7%
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	193	47.7%	18.7%	18.7%	15.0%
10	552	**Dayton, OH**	25	48.0%	24.0%	20.0%	8.0%

Table 28 cont. Type of Discharge from CWT/VI by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Mutually Agreed/Planned Discharge %	Failure to Comply with Program Requirements %	Left Before Planned Discharge %	Other†† %
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	37	**35.1%**	8.1%	48.6%	8.1%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	52	40.4%	21.2%	30.8%	7.7%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	32	59.4%	**31.3%**	6.3%	3.1%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	46	56.5%	19.6%	13.0%	10.9%
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	166	84.9%	9.6%	4.8%	0.6%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	25	**36.0%**	20.0%	32.0%	12.0%
12	607	**Madison, WI**	32	**21.9%**	**28.1%**	21.9%	28.1%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	65	**29.2%**	18.5%	41.5%	10.8%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	38	**36.8%**	**47.4%**	13.2%	2.6%
15	589	**Kansas City, MO**	87	50.6%	25.3%	23.0%	1.1%
15	589A5	**Topeka, KS**	29	41.4%	**27.6%**	17.2%	13.8%
15	589A6	**Leavenworth, KS**	48	62.5%	14.6%	10.4%	12.5%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	124	40.3%	19.4%	37.1%	3.2%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	222	47.7%	19.4%	22.5%	10.4%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	43	57.4%	13.0%	29.6%	0.0%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	125	53.6%	17.6%	28.8%	0.0%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	59	**13.6%**	13.6%	69.5%	3.4%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	91	**28.6%**	**40.7%**	27.5%	3.3%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	45	77.8%	13.3%	8.9%	0.0%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	124	72.6%	0.0%	25.8%	1.6%
17	549DT	**Dallas (downtown), TX**	325	**25.2%**	20.0%	51.7%	3.1%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	41	**29.3%**	17.1%	43.9%	9.8%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	207	57.5%	21.3%	18.4%	2.9%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	54	44.4%	14.8%	37.0%	3.7%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	83	63.9%	15.7%	9.6%	10.8%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	52	42.3%	15.4%	30.8%	11.5%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	31	51.6%	16.1%	22.6%	9.7%
19	666	**Sheridan, WY**	16	37.5%	12.5%	43.8%	6.3%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	48	68.8%	8.3%	14.6%	8.3%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	72	62.5%	20.8%	15.3%	1.4%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	115	53.9%	**27.0%**	12.2%	7.0%
20	692	**White City, OR**	171	47.4%	11.1%	30.4%	11.1%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	12	75.0%	16.7%	8.3%	0.0%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	80	45.0%	12.5%	37.5%	5.0%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	14	**14.3%**	7.1%	71.4%	7.1%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	63	68.3%	12.7%	14.3%	4.8%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	30	90.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	92	56.5%	10.9%	20.7%	12.0%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	23	52.2%	8.7%	34.8%	4.3%
23	437	**Fargo, ND**	16	56.3%	12.5%	31.3%	0.0%
23	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	40	45.0%	**30.0%**	22.5%	2.5%
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	118	42.4%	**26.3%**	28.0%	3.4%
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	56	57.1%	16.1%	16.1%	10.7%
23	636	**Omaha, NE**	18	44.4%	**27.8%**	22.2%	5.6%
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	223	57.0%	7.6%	24.2%	11.2%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,078)				**53.4%**	**16.8%**	**24.0%**	**5.8%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=96)				**54.7%**	**17.0%**	**22.4%**	**5.8%**
SITE S.D.				**17.7%**	**8.8%**	**14.1%**	**5.1%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY05:
VISN 1, Togus; VISN 10, Columbus; VISN 15, Poplar Bluff; VISN 18, El Paso; and VISN 19, Colorado Springs.

†† Veteran became too ill to work in CWT/VI or other unspecified reason for discharge.

Table 29. Time Worked and Earnings in CWT/VI by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Total Mean Hours Worked in CWT/VI	Mean Hours Worked Per Week	Mean # of Weeks Worked	Total Mean Earnings in CWT/VI	Mean Weekly Earnings in CWT/VI	Mean Hourly Wage in CWT/VI ††
1	405	**White River Junction, VT**	27	321.0	21.8	15.9	$2,784.11	$179.09	$8.01
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	258	810.4	**19.1**	44.3	$7,032.71	$160.70	$8.55
1	523	**Boston, MA**	25	2022.4	33.4	60.5	$16,092.44	$265.11	$7.93
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	119	407.8	**17.2**	23.3	$3,109.33	$129.38	$7.43
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	126	438.5	20.5	16.5	$2,608.74	$121.81	$5.88
1	650	**Providence, RI**	79	400.1	**7.5**	57.9	$2,667.61	$49.02	$6.50
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	24	277.0	**16.3**	21.0	$1,982.63	$115.10	$7.17
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	100	766.1	32.4	25.1	$4,015.82	$169.16	$5.23
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	31	310.1	23.0	14.7	$1,700.97	$121.86	$5.34
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	73	219.0	30.0	7.3	$1,129.73	$155.58	$5.24
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	47	1011.6	32.5	31.3	$5,412.06	$174.74	$5.37
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	91	646.0	29.5	20.9	$3,599.26	$154.80	**$5.07**
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	126	725.2	33.6	21.5	$4,690.00	$214.61	$6.42
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**	36	1836.1	30.6	55.8	$12,833.97	$216.79	$7.07
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	190	174.2	36.4	5.1	$1,345.57	$237.50	$6.58
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	131	378.8	32.1	12.2	$2,277.47	$193.31	$6.02
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	71	738.5	29.3	25.9	$4,468.99	$176.76	$6.04
3	632	**Northport, NY**	80	645.4	24.6	23.6	$3,157.01	$110.56	**$4.14**
4	529	**Butler, PA**	45	220.0	22.8	10.7	$1,158.09	$120.46	$5.27
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	277	284.6	24.7	10.7	$1,590.40	$136.78	$5.34
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	72	547.2	36.6	15.1	$3,382.85	$217.60	$5.97
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	134	500.6	27.3	18.0	$2,944.85	$158.85	$6.41
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	49	536.3	24.7	22.2	$2,893.61	$137.15	$5.47
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	39	271.8	23.5	12.1	$1,376.28	$119.63	$5.97
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	111	334.2	33.1	9.8	$1,728.32	$170.87	$5.16
5	688	**Washington, DC**	92	1322.3	33.7	38.1	$7,810.61	$243.21	$5.82
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	64	624.9	29.8	20.5	$3,493.09	$165.59	$5.59
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	24	799.8	34.4	23.3	$4,667.17	$200.42	$5.82
6	652	**Richmond, VA**	19	609.4	29.6	20.3	$3,308.74	$158.81	$5.36
6	658	**Salem, VA**	73	340.2	28.9	13.5	$2,055.18	$176.20	$6.12
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	136	748.5	33.0	22.5	$4,190.07	$181.30	$5.51
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	88	915.5	25.1	36.9	$6,374.42	$156.08	$5.96
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	33	820.5	31.6	24.5	$4,638.00	$178.26	$5.61
7	544	**Columbia, SC**	186	657.5	40.0	17.9	$3,731.68	$220.08	$5.44
7	557	**Dublin, GA**	52	444.3	32.9	13.8	$2,445.69	$180.97	$5.50
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	138	462.7	33.0	14.3	$2,929.86	$208.11	$6.43
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	127	327.7	23.9	13.1	$1,804.22	$128.78	$5.45
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	82	624.1	31.2	20.6	$3,309.73	$162.85	$5.22
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	85	599.6	35.4	16.3	$3,246.01	$190.46	$5.38
8	573	**Gainesville/Lake City, FL**	58	434.3	27.1	16.1	$2,828.17	$176.85	$6.55
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	111	589.4	33.5	17.8	$3,125.61	$179.11	$5.35
8	673OR	**Orlando, FL**	63	581.3	31.7	18.0	$3,117.52	$171.62	$5.44
9	596	**Lexington, KY**	19	493.1	31.1	16.1	$3,042.05	$190.92	$6.14
9	603	**Louisville, KY**	15	235.7	22.0	9.6	$1,262.60	$118.90	$5.41
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	49	484.4	25.9	17.1	$2,493.22	$133.39	$5.15
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	93	718.6	31.4	22.9	$3,733.90	$163.04	$5.20
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	48	814.9	33.1	25.7	$4,870.92	$195.95	$5.90
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	157	182.1	**17.0**	11.5	$1,120.45	$107.86	$6.21
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	169	493.6	**19.5**	23.6	$3,530.55	$138.38	$7.08
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	193	529.8	28.6	16.9	$3,533.96	$192.91	$6.82
10	552	**Dayton, OH**	25	371.8	23.1	20.1	$2,322.12	$141.82	$6.19

Table 29 cont. Time Worked and Earnings in CWT/VI by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Total Mean Hours Worked in CWT/VI	Mean Hours Worked Per Week	Mean # of Weeks Worked	Total Mean Earnings in CWT/VI	Mean Weekly Earnings in CWT/VI	Mean Hourly Wage in CWT/VI ††
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	37	737.5	21.9	35.7	$4,268.30	$128.6	$5.74
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	52	432.2	27.7	15.7	$2,990.73	$194.4	$6.95
11	550	Danville, IL	32	1,128.2	29.3	37.0	$7,156.28	$188.0	$6.32
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	731.8	28.2	32.7	$4,797.59	$165.9	$5.71
12	556	North Chicago, IL	166	244.1	30.9	7.6	$1,602.99	$183.6	$5.93
12	578	Hines, IL	25	2,618.4	25.9	110.1	$14,410.64	$143.7	$5.53
12	607	Madison, WI	32	557.1	31.5	18.3	$5,119.72	$288.9	$9.05
12	676	Tomah, WI	65	627.3	24.4	27.3	$4,290.62	$165.4	$6.65
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	38	1,689.4	31.1	51.4	$15,457.00	$263.6	$8.86
15	589	Kansas City, MO	87	788.0	29.2	26.4	$5,662.67	$198.5	$6.63
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	29	1,292.9	33.1	40.8	$7,193.90	$181.4	$5.66
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	48	429.0	34.8	13.5	$2,250.92	$182.2	$5.24
16	520	Biloxi, MS	124	341.6	27.4	12.0	$1,995.60	$158.3	$5.76
16	580	Houston, TX	222	744.3	30.9	23.0	$4,632.39	$184.6	$5.95
16	586	Jackson, MS	43	668.4	32.4	19.8	$3,945.15	$189.1	$5.70
16	598	Little Rock, AR	125	509.2	37.4	13.5	$3,073.34	$217.1	$5.78
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	59	357.5	18.7	19.0	$2,029.88	$105.8	$5.59
17	549	Dallas, TX	91	1,096.6	27.1	35.0	$6,935.25	$172.6	$6.42
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	45	495.1	33.8	14.6	$2,555.69	$174.0	$5.15
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	432.9	14.1	34.8	$2,365.98	$69.4	$4.53
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX	325	344.7	13.6	16.7	$2,081.42	$70.5	$4.72
17	671	San Antonio, TX	41	679.0	31.2	21.4	$4,032.37	$184.6	$5.90
17	674	Temple, TX	207	214.7	10.6	18.4	$1,313.13	$63.8	$5.59
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	54	286.7	13.1	25.8	$1,765.37	$81.7	$7.13
18	649	Prescott, AZ	83	285.5	24.0	11.4	$1,804.39	$152.2	$6.47
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	978.6	34.6	27.8	$5,791.17	$204.3	$5.91
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	31	1,419.4	26.1	54.9	$8,491.71	$158.2	$6.05
19	666	Sheridan, WY	16	332.4	23.2	16.6	$1,998.13	$1,322.9	$5.52
20	463	Anchorage, AK	48	826.4	29.6	29.5	$4,971.04	$175.6	$5.98
20	648	Portland, OR	72	542.5	32.1	17.1	$4,177.78	$243.0	$7.57
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	115	378.3	24.8	17.7	$2,305.64	$146.2	$5.81
20	692	White City, OR	171	372.0	21.7	19.5	$2,094.96	$131.1	$5.92
21	459	Honolulu, HI	12	958.3	14.4	68.2	$6,011.00	$90.3	$7.04
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	80	1,143.2	33.4	34.5	$11,464.09	$333.3	$9.99
21	654	Reno, NV	14	207.1	8.4	38.0	$1,114.71	$46.9	$5.32
21	662	San Francisco, CA	63	808.1	27.9	28.3	$6,220.21	$213.3	$7.59
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	1,141.2	35.4	32.0	$6,385.67	$197.0	$5.58
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	92	662.4	21.3	30.2	$4,227.49	$135.7	$6.37
22	664	San Diego, CA	23	755.7	15.2	48.7	$5,294.17	$104.5	$6.87
23	437	Fargo, ND	16	801.6	33.0	23.9	$4,488.25	$187.7	$5.64
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	40	980.7	30.5	29.9	$5,895.05	$183.0	$6.02
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	118	484.1	34.1	14.2	$2,978.65	$208.7	$6.08
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	56	1,186.9	30.4	39.7	$6,321.32	$160.7	$5.26
23	636	Omaha, NE	18	165.9	17.2	8.9	$1,013.50	$105.8	$6.06
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	223	159.0	35.0	6.8	$1,245.97	$284.96	$7.19
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,078)				**555.3**	**27.0**	**21.2**	**$3,522.88**	**$168.47**	**$6.07**
SITE AVERAGE (N=96)				**646.7**	**27.3**	**24.6**	**$4,074.90**	**$179.27**	**$6.09**
SITE S.D.				**411.6**	**6.9**	**15.4**	**$2,921.73**	**$127.48**	**$0.96**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY05: VISN 1, Togus; VISN 10, Columbus; VISN 15, Poplar Bluff; VISN 18, El Paso; and VISN 19, Colorado Springs.

†† Mean hourly wage is calculated by taking each veteran's total earnings in CWT/VI and dividing it by the veteran's total hours worked in CWT/VI.

Table 30a. CWT/VI Workshop Participation by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Any Workshop Placement %	Workshop on VA Grounds %	Workshop in the Community %	Workshop Placement Only %
1	405	**White River Junction, VT**	27	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	258	22.5%	12.0%	10.5%	12.0%
1	523	**Boston, MA**	25	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	119	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	126	100.0%	100.0%	0.8%	50.8%
1	650	**Providence, RI**	79	98.7%	81.0%	24.1%	74.7%
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	24	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	100	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%	1.0%
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	31	22.6%	19.4%	3.2%	12.9%
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	73	2.7%	1.4%	1.4%	2.7%
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	47	6.4%	4.3%	4.3%	4.3%
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	91	97.8%	0.0%	97.8%	22.0%
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	126	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**	36	80.6%	80.6%	0.0%	0.0%
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	190	10.0%	7.9%	4.2%	3.7%
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	131	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	71	1.4%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%
3	632	**Northport, NY**	80	35.0%	35.0%	0.0%	35.0%
4	529	**Butler, PA**	45	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	277	0.7%	0.7%	0.0%	0.4%
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	72	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	134	89.6%	89.6%	0.0%	23.9%
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	49	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	39	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	111	0.9%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%
5	688	**Washington, DC**	92	7.6%	5.4%	3.3%	2.2%
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	64	7.8%	6.3%	1.6%	4.7%
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	24	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	652	**Richmond, VA**	19	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	658	**Salem, VA**	73	1.4%	1.4%	0.0%	1.4%
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	136	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	88	60.2%	60.2%	0.0%	51.1%
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	33	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	544	**Columbia, SC**	186	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.0%
7	557	**Dublin, GA**	52	3.8%	3.8%	0.0%	3.8%
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	138	3.6%	1.4%	2.9%	0.7%
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	127	51.2%	51.2%	0.0%	29.1%
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	82	7.3%	7.3%	0.0%	7.3%
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	85	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
8	573	**Gainesville/Lake City, FL**	58	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	111	9.0%	8.1%	0.9%	1.8%
8	673OR	**Orlando, FL**	63	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9	596	**Lexington, KY**	19	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9	603	**Louisville, KY**	15	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	49	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	93	11.8%	11.8%	0.0%	4.3%
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	48	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	157	98.1%	98.1%	0.0%	47.8%
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	169	1.2%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	193	96.9%	96.4%	0.5%	63.7%
10	552	**Dayton, OH**	25	64.0%	52.0%	12.0%	64.0%

Table 30a cont. CWT/VI Workshop Participation by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Any Workshop Placement %	Workshop on VA Grounds %	Workshop in the Community %	Workshop Placement Only %
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	37	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%	0.0%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	52	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	44.2%
11	550	Danville, IL	32	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	2.2%	0.0%	2.2%	2.2%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	166	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%
12	578	Hines, IL	25	48.0%	48.0%	4.0%	0.0%
12	607	Madison, WI	32	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12	676	Tomah, WI	65	60.0%	60.0%	1.5%	30.8%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	38	31.6%	26.3%	5.3%	18.4%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	87	100.0%	100.0%	2.3%	18.4%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	29	93.1%	93.1%	0.0%	10.3%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	48	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	124	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%
16	580	Houston, TX	222	16.7%	16.7%	0.0%	12.2%
16	586	Jackson, MS	43	1.9%	0.0%	1.9%	1.9%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	125	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	59	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	45.8%
17	549	Dallas, TX	91	100.0%	100.0%	2.2%	28.6%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	45	2.2%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	99.2%	4.0%	99.2%	95.2%
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX	325	91.4%	41.5%	63.4%	57.2%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	41	2.4%	0.0%	2.4%	2.4%
17	674	Temple, TX	207	89.4%	88.9%	6.8%	44.9%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	54	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	83	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	31	6.5%	6.5%	0.0%	6.5%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	16	37.5%	31.3%	6.3%	37.5%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	48	45.8%	45.8%	0.0%	8.3%
20	648	Portland, OR	72	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	115	31.3%	31.3%	0.0%	20.0%
20	692	White City, OR	171	31.6%	14.6%	17.0%	29.2%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	12	25.0%	25.0%	0.0%	25.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	80	2.5%	1.3%	1.3%	2.5%
21	654	Reno, NV	14	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	63	1.6%	0.0%	1.6%	1.6%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	92	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
22	664	San Diego, CA	23	4.3%	4.3%	0.0%	4.3%
23	437	Fargo, ND	16	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	40	37.5%	37.5%	5.0%	12.5%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	118	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	56	3.6%	0.0%	3.6%	3.6%
23	636	Omaha, NE	18	88.9%	88.9%	0.0%	88.9%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	223	32.7%	32.7%	0.0%	32.7%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,078)				**29.2%**	**23.3%**	**6.9%**	**16.2%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=96)				**23.8%**	**20.2%**	**4.2%**	**12.6%**
SITE S.D.				**35.4%**	**32.6%**	**15.5%**	**21.2%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04:
VISN 1, Togus; VISN 10, Columbus; VISN 15, Poplar Bluff; VISN 18, El Paso and VISN 19, Colorado Springs.

Table 30b. CWT/VI Transitional Work Experience Participation by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Any Transitional Work Experience Placement %	Transitional Work Experience on VA Grounds %	Transitional Work Experience in the Community %	Transitional Work Experience Only %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	27	100.0%	77.8%	40.7%	100.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	258	88.0%	38.4%	73.6%	77.5%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	100.0%	100.0%	16.0%	100.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	119	99.2%	95.0%	5.0%	99.2%
1	631	Northampton, MA	126	49.2%	48.4%	7.9%	0.0%
1	650	Providence, RI	79	25.3%	22.8%	8.9%	1.3%
1	689	West Haven, CT	24	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	100	99.0%	98.0%	4.0%	99.0%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	31	87.1%	80.6%	6.5%	77.4%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	73	97.3%	91.8%	5.5%	97.3%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	47	95.7%	95.7%	4.3%	93.6%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	91	78.0%	70.3%	9.9%	2.2%
3	526	Bronx, NY	126	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	36	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	19.4%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	190	90.5%	57.4%	33.7%	84.2%
3	620	Montrose, NY	131	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	99.2%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	71	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	98.6%
3	632	Northport, NY	80	63.8%	57.5%	6.3%	63.8%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	277	99.6%	99.6%	0.0%	99.3%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	72	100.0%	97.2%	2.8%	100.0%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	134	76.1%	60.4%	19.4%	10.4%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	49	100.0%	91.8%	14.3%	100.0%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	39	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	111	100.0%	100.0%	9.0%	99.1%
5	688	Washington, DC	92	95.7%	85.9%	22.8%	90.2%
6	590	Hampton, VA	64	79.7%	76.6%	7.8%	76.6%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	91.7%	70.8%	33.3%	91.7%
6	652	Richmond, VA	19	100.0%	94.7%	5.3%	100.0%
6	658	Salem, VA	73	98.6%	98.6%	1.4%	98.6%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	136	100.0%	97.1%	6.6%	99.3%
7	509	Augusta, GA	88	48.9%	48.9%	0.0%	39.8%
7	534	Charleston, SC	33	100.0%	84.8%	27.3%	100.0%
7	544	Columbia, SC	186	99.5%	93.0%	7.0%	98.9%
7	557	Dublin, GA	52	96.2%	96.2%	0.0%	96.2%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	138	99.3%	97.1%	6.5%	96.4%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	127	70.9%	51.2%	35.4%	48.8%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	82	92.7%	92.7%	0.0%	92.7%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	85	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	58	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
8	673	Tampa, FL	111	98.2%	98.2%	0.9%	91.0%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	63	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
9	596	Lexington, KY	19	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
9	603	Louisville, KY	15	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	49	100.0%	98.0%	2.0%	100.0%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	93	95.7%	95.7%	0.0%	88.2%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	48	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	157	52.2%	31.8%	31.2%	1.9%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	169	99.4%	20.7%	95.3%	98.8%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	193	36.3%	36.3%	0.5%	3.1%
10	552	Dayton, OH	25	36.0%	16.0%	20.0%	36.0%

Table 30b cont. CWT/VI Transitional Work Experience Participation by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Any Transitional Work Experience Placement %	Transitional Work Experience on VA Grounds %	Transitional Work Experience in the Community %	Transitional Work Experience Only %
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	37	94.6%	94.6%	5.4%	91.9%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	52	55.8%	55.8%	0.0%	0.0%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	32	100.0%	90.6%	9.4%	100.0%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	46	97.8%	76.1%	21.7%	97.8%
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	166	100.0%	95.8%	10.2%	99.4%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	25	100.0%	100.0%	12.0%	52.0%
12	607	**Madison, WI**	32	100.0%	62.5%	46.9%	100.0%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	65	69.2%	27.7%	47.7%	40.0%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	38	81.6%	39.5%	52.6%	68.4%
15	589	**Kansas City, MO**	87	81.6%	47.1%	47.1%	0.0%
15	589A5	**Topeka, KS**	29	89.7%	34.5%	58.6%	6.9%
15	589A6	**Leavenworth, KS**	48	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	124	99.2%	99.2%	0.8%	99.2%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	222	87.8%	86.9%	1.8%	83.3%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	43	98.1%	98.1%	0.0%	98.1%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	125	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	59	54.2%	54.2%	1.7%	0.0%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	91	71.4%	70.3%	6.6%	0.0%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	45	100.0%	100.0%	8.9%	97.8%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	124	4.8%	4.8%	4.0%	0.8%
17	549DT	**Dallas (downtown), TX**	325	34.5%	33.8%	2.2%	0.3%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	41	97.6%	97.6%	0.0%	97.6%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	207	45.4%	41.1%	12.6%	1.0%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	54	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	83	100.0%	95.2%	4.8%	100.0%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	52	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	31	93.5%	93.5%	0.0%	93.5%
19	666	**Sheridan, WY**	16	62.5%	12.5%	50.0%	62.5%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	48	91.7%	58.3%	64.6%	54.2%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	72	100.0%	93.1%	6.9%	100.0%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	115	80.0%	76.5%	4.3%	68.7%
20	692	**White City, OR**	171	70.8%	27.5%	45.0%	68.4%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	12	75.0%	66.7%	16.7%	75.0%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	80	97.5%	68.8%	35.0%	97.5%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	14	100.0%	92.9%	28.6%	100.0%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	63	98.4%	85.7%	12.7%	98.4%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	30	100.0%	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	92	100.0%	100.0%	12.0%	100.0%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	23	95.7%	87.0%	8.7%	95.7%
23	437	**Fargo, ND**	16	100.0%	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%
23	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	40	87.5%	50.0%	42.5%	62.5%
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	118	100.0%	49.2%	60.2%	99.2%
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	56	96.4%	96.4%	0.0%	96.4%
23	636	**Omaha, NE**	18	5.6%	5.6%	0.0%	5.6%
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	223	67.3%	6.3%	61.0%	67.3%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,078)				**82.8%**	**70.6%**	**16.5%**	**69.8%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=96)				**86.7%**	**76.2%**	**14.6%**	**75.5%**
SITE S.D.				**21.7%**	**28.0%**	**20.0%**	**35.7%**

Table 31. Average Work Improvement Score and Improvement in Work Performance Areas by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Average Work Improvement ††	WORK PERFORMANCE AREAS †††					
					Personal Appearance/ Hygiene	Attendance/ Punctuality	Acceptance of Supervision	Ability to Get Along with Co-workers	Productivity	Quality of Production
1	405	**White River Junction, VT**	27	1.8	74.1%	88.9%	74.1%	77.8%	88.9%	92.6%
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	258	1.1	17.1%	26.1%	25.6%	26.4%	26.4%	26.4%
1	523	**Boston, MA**	25	1.7	76.0%	76.0%	76.0%	64.0%	72.0%	72.0%
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	119	1.8	66.7%	82.4%	84.0%	84.9%	76.5%	79.0%
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	126	1.8	78.6%	80.2%	80.2%	78.6%	74.6%	77.0%
1	650	**Providence, RI**	79	1.2	34.4%	22.7%	27.0%	23.6%	37.2%	42.7%
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	24	1.6	87.5%	66.7%	75.0%	54.2%	45.8%	58.3%
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	100	1.3	38.4%	24.0%	40.0%	39.0%	42.4%	39.4%
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	31	1.4	56.7%	45.2%	51.6%	48.4%	51.6%	51.6%
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	73	1.9	93.2%	89.0%	90.4%	90.4%	87.7%	87.7%
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	47	1.6	69.6%	69.6%	70.2%	68.1%	70.2%	72.3%
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	91	1.4	38.9%	44.0%	47.3%	53.8%	59.3%	61.5%
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	126	1.6	100.0%	57.9%	97.6%	100.0%	57.9%	57.9%
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**	36	1.9	88.2%	94.3%	94.4%	94.4%	94.4%	94.4%
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	190	2.0	97.6%	97.4%	97.4%	98.4%	97.4%	97.9%
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	131	1.3	15.0%	33.1%	34.4%	31.0%	33.3%	33.1%
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	71	1.3	45.1%	45.1%	46.5%	49.3%	49.3%	47.8%
3	632	**Northport, NY**	80	1.4	46.2%	52.5%	48.8%	48.8%	60.0%	60.0%
4	529	**Butler, PA**	45	1.3	35.6%	37.8%	40.0%	42.2%	40.0%	37.8%
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	277	1.8	93.1%	74.5%	83.6%	83.3%	81.5%	81.5%
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	72	2.0	97.2%	100.0%	98.6%	97.2%	100.0%	100.0%
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	134	1.9	95.5%	81.3%	90.3%	94.0%	89.6%	91.0%
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	49	1.8	84.6%	86.7%	91.5%	91.3%	87.8%	85.4%
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	39	1.4	29.7%	43.6%	34.2%	40.5%	46.2%	46.2%
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	111	1.8	88.3%	79.3%	81.1%	82.0%	79.3%	82.0%
5	688	**Washington, DC**	92	1.8	65.9%	79.1%	87.0%	85.9%	79.1%	78.3%
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	64	1.9	93.8%	96.9%	96.9%	93.8%	92.2%	93.8%
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	24	1.5	70.8%	58.3%	54.2%	50.0%	58.3%	58.3%
6	652	**Richmond, VA**	19	1.3	42.1%	36.8%	47.4%	47.4%	42.1%	42.1%
6	658	**Salem, VA**	73	1.9	95.9%	87.7%	91.8%	94.5%	83.6%	87.7%
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	136	1.5	100.0%	69.1%	69.1%	69.9%	68.4%	68.4%
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	88	1.7	65.9%	63.6%	61.4%	59.1%	84.1%	84.1%
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	33	1.9	100.0%	81.8%	93.9%	97.0%	93.9%	97.0%
7	544	**Columbia, SC**	186	1.2	40.3%	30.1%	30.6%	30.6%	31.2%	31.2%
7	557	**Dublin, GA**	52	1.9	86.5%	94.2%	88.5%	88.2%	94.1%	96.2%
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	138	2.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	127	1.6	70.1%	61.4%	66.7%	69.8%	55.6%	61.1%
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	82	1.8	79.3%	76.8%	82.9%	79.3%	79.3%	79.3%
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	85	1.6	76.5%	67.1%	67.1%	65.9%	64.7%	65.9%
8	573	**Gainesville/Lake City, FL**	58	1.6	66.7%	69.0%	69.0%	67.2%	67.2%	67.2%
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	111	1.8	94.8%	89.1%	89.0%	90.7%	84.7%	84.7%
8	673OR	**Orlando, FL**	63	2.0	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
9	596	**Lexington, KY**	19	1.3	26.3%	36.8%	52.6%	52.6%	31.6%	36.8%
9	603	**Louisville, KY**	15	1.7	92.9%	85.7%	66.7%	78.6%	73.3%	73.3%
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	49	1.7	85.7%	83.7%	75.5%	79.6%	75.5%	75.5%
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	93	1.9	91.4%	91.4%	91.4%	90.3%	90.3%	90.3%
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	48	1.6	60.4%	52.1%	60.4%	62.5%	66.7%	66.7%
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	157	1.9	96.8%	96.8%	93.6%	95.5%	93.0%	93.0%
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	169	1.8	78.1%	79.3%	79.9%	79.9%	73.3%	73.3%
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	193	1.9	97.4%	89.1%	89.1%	93.3%	90.7%	92.7%
10	552	**Dayton, OH**	25	1.5	72.0%	60.0%	58.3%	66.7%	54.2%	58.3%

Table 31 cont. Average Work Improvement Score and Improvement in Work Performance Areas by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Average Work Improvement ††	Personal Appearance/ Hygiene	Attendance/ Punctuality	Acceptance of Supervision	Ability to Get Along with Co-workers	Productivity	Quality of Production
							WORK PERFORMANCE AREAS †††			
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	37	1.0	8.1%	2.7%	5.4%	10.8%	8.1%	8.1%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	52	1.6	71.2%	61.5%	69.2%	75.0%	67.3%	67.3%
11	550	Danville, IL	32	1.7	90.3%	84.4%	78.1%	71.9%	68.8%	68.8%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	1.5	56.5%	50.0%	41.3%	41.3%	65.2%	65.2%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	166	1.9	98.2%	93.4%	95.2%	97.0%	91.6%	95.2%
12	578	Hines, IL	25	1.4	54.2%	48.0%	56.0%	60.0%	52.0%	48.0%
12	607	Madison, WI	32	1.5	36.4%	68.8%	62.5%	68.8%	62.5%	59.4%
12	676	Tomah, WI	65	1.7	74.6%	67.2%	78.5%	78.5%	80.0%	84.6%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	38	1.8	63.9%	72.2%	78.9%	78.9%	81.6%	86.8%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	87	1.7	80.5%	66.7%	71.3%	73.6%	71.3%	77.0%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	29	1.4	53.6%	44.8%	41.4%	41.4%	44.8%	41.4%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	48	1.9	95.8%	93.8%	91.7%	93.8%	89.6%	91.7%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	124	1.7	81.8%	75.0%	76.6%	79.8%	75.8%	76.6%
16	580	Houston, TX	222	1.8	87.8%	68.3%	83.3%	84.2%	87.8%	89.2%
16	586	Jackson, MS	43	1.1	11.1%	7.4%	16.7%	9.3%	35.2%	16.7%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	125	1.3	32.0%	32.8%	32.8%	30.4%	42.4%	41.6%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	59	1.5	76.3%	54.2%	86.4%	83.1%	55.9%	78.0%
17	549	Dallas, TX	91	1.5	54.4%	51.6%	52.7%	52.7%	54.9%	54.9%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	45	2.0	97.8%	97.8%	97.8%	95.6%	97.8%	97.8%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	1.7	70.2%	67.7%	66.7%	69.4%	65.3%	63.7%
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX	325	1.1	31.2%	23.7%	26.5%	29.8%	26.2%	24.0%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	41	1.4	56.1%	41.5%	46.3%	61.0%	63.4%	65.9%
17	674	Temple, TX	207	1.8	86.9%	80.0%	82.1%	80.9%	82.5%	82.0%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	54	1.4	68.5%	57.4%	53.7%	64.2%	58.6%	71.0%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	83	1.8	77.1%	77.1%	77.1%	77.1%	77.1%	77.1%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	1.6	71.2%	65.4%	76.9%	76.9%	69.2%	69.2%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	31	1.7	70.6%	75.0%	69.0%	72.7%	77.4%	80.0%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	16	1.2	43.8%	37.5%	25.0%	25.0%	6.3%	6.3%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	48	1.8	93.8%	79.2%	89.6%	89.6%	89.6%	87.5%
20	648	Portland, OR	72	1.9	100.0%	88.2%	95.7%	97.2%	98.6%	100.0%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	115	1.0	3.5%	3.5%	5.2%	6.1%	17.4%	13.9%
20	692	White City, OR	171	1.7	84.2%	77.8%	79.5%	80.0%	77.2%	79.5%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	12	1.7	83.3%	66.7%	58.3%	66.7%	81.8%	75.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	80	1.6	71.4%	70.9%	72.5%	71.3%	72.2%	71.3%
21	654	Reno, NV	14	1.1	50.0%	35.7%	28.6%	21.4%	35.7%	35.7%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	63	1.6	77.8%	71.4%	68.3%	77.8%	79.4%	76.2%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	1.9	90.0%	93.3%	90.0%	93.3%	96.7%	96.7%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	92	1.9	81.5%	83.7%	91.3%	91.3%	91.3%	92.4%
22	664	San Diego, CA	23	1.7	86.7%	76.2%	78.3%	78.3%	87.0%	87.0%
23	437	Fargo, ND	16	1.7	75.0%	75.0%	75.0%	62.5%	62.5%	68.8%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	40	1.4	70.0%	50.0%	57.5%	65.0%	60.0%	75.0%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	118	1.9	98.3%	88.1%	89.8%	92.4%	91.5%	94.9%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	56	1.7	76.8%	67.9%	73.2%	71.4%	76.8%	76.8%
23	636	Omaha, NE	18	1.2	11.1%	11.1%	38.9%	27.8%	55.6%	50.0%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	223	1.5	50.7%	50.2%	50.7%	52.0%	70.0%	70.9%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,078)				1.63	70.8%	65.7%	69.0%	69.8%	69.1%	69.9%
SITE AVERAGE (N=96)				1.62	69.8%	65.5%	68.0%	68.5%	68.5%	69.5%
SITE S.D.				0.26	25.0%	23.8%	23.3%	23.6%	21.8%	22.5%

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY05: VISN 1, Togus; VISN 10, Columbus; VISN 15, Poplar Bluff; VISN 18, El Paso; and VISN 19, Colorado Springs.

†† Average Work Improvement score is the mean of the five work performance areas, range 0-2 (0=deteriorated, 1=unchanged, and 2=improved).

††† Improvement is noted for only those veterans with a problem in that category.

Table 32. Percent of Veterans Rated by Clinicians as Clinically Improved by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Alcohol Problems Improved %	Drug Problems Improved %	Non-Substance Abuse Mental Health Problems Improved %	Medical Problems Improved %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	27	100.0%	92.3%	88.5%	55.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	258	23.6%	26.5%	19.0%	11.2%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	56.5%	55.0%	40.0%	40.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	119	73.6%	74.4%	54.1%	26.3%
1	631	Northampton, MA	126	56.1%	62.5%	62.7%	62.4%
1	650	Providence, RI	79	31.9%	35.1%	29.6%	17.2%
1	689	West Haven, CT	24	81.3%	78.6%	59.1%	23.8%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	100	55.0%	42.6%	50.0%	9.3%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	31	80.8%	79.2%	30.0%	60.0%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	73	89.0%	90.4%	93.2%	94.5%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	47	80.6%	75.0%	56.7%	34.3%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	91	46.5%	46.2%	23.8%	0.0%
3	526	Bronx, NY	126	73.6%	59.3%	54.8%	21.4%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	36	88.2%	90.3%	100.0%	14.3%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	190	95.9%	97.0%	94.0%	89.0%
3	620	Montrose, NY	131	33.9%	33.3%	12.6%	7.4%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	71	46.9%	48.4%	44.8%	27.4%
3	632	Northport, NY	80	49.1%	50.0%	40.4%	23.9%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	86.8%	86.8%	45.2%	10.5%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	277	91.1%	92.0%	81.3%	71.1%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	72	100.0%	100.0%	92.9%	69.2%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	134	89.9%	87.0%	83.1%	16.7%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	49	39.3%	31.3%	35.9%	8.3%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	39	84.0%	73.7%	75.0%	9.5%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	111	78.1%	81.8%	70.8%	71.3%
5	688	Washington, DC	92	70.8%	67.2%	70.4%	52.4%
6	590	Hampton, VA	64	84.7%	84.7%	42.9%	15.6%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	42.9%	33.3%	47.1%	31.8%
6	652	Richmond, VA	19	14.3%	12.5%	7.1%	0.0%
6	658	Salem, VA	73	76.7%	84.0%	82.9%	60.7%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	136	64.9%	65.8%	55.2%	45.7%
7	509	Augusta, GA	88	63.8%	59.3%	59.0%	10.8%
7	534	Charleston, SC	33	78.8%	81.8%	84.8%	97.0%
7	544	Columbia, SC	186	27.9%	29.4%	35.7%	26.0%
7	557	Dublin, GA	52	77.4%	81.5%	81.5%	74.3%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	138	100.0%	96.9%	99.3%	100.0%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	127	65.3%	66.3%	60.3%	55.7%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	82	86.2%	80.5%	69.0%	50.9%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	85	68.9%	67.2%	64.5%	33.3%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	58	78.0%	70.6%	50.0%	30.8%
8	673	Tampa, FL	111	90.8%	91.6%	42.9%	17.9%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	63	98.0%	98.0%	96.7%	0.0%
9	596	Lexington, KY	19	33.3%	18.2%	31.3%	0.0%
9	603	Louisville, KY	15	71.4%	83.3%	40.0%	0.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	49	73.8%	78.4%	67.5%	76.3%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	93	79.2%	80.4%	80.0%	85.4%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	48	64.4%	60.5%	20.0%	5.9%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	157	94.5%	95.4%	95.2%	51.6%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	169	73.2%	73.9%	73.0%	66.9%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	193	84.7%	85.8%	66.7%	50.0%
10	552	Dayton, OH	25	50.0%	52.9%	64.3%	66.7%

Table 32 cont. Percent of Veterans Rated by Clinicians as Clinically Improved by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Alcohol Problems Improved %	Drug Problems Improved %	Non-Substance Abuse Mental Health Problems Improved %	Medical Problems Improved %
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	37	13.3%	6.9%	14.3%	13.5%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	52	42.3%	38.0%	34.8%	29.2%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	32	81.5%	55.0%	66.7%	37.5%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	46	54.3%	60.0%	47.4%	30.0%
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	166	91.3%	88.1%	78.9%	80.0%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	25	37.5%	42.1%	27.3%	33.3%
12	607	**Madison, WI**	32	74.1%	81.0%	46.4%	3.8%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	65	84.5%	69.7%	68.4%	81.4%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	38	73.5%	71.0%	61.1%	41.2%
15	589	**Kansas City, MO**	87	62.1%	58.5%	56.1%	57.3%
15	589A5	**Topeka, KS**	29	62.5%	54.5%	21.4%	12.5%
15	589A6	**Leavenworth, KS**	48	83.3%	83.0%	62.8%	71.4%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	124	70.1%	72.6%	52.7%	47.1%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	222	73.1%	67.3%	66.9%	45.5%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	43	50.0%	58.3%	58.1%	18.2%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	125	60.2%	57.1%	25.0%	12.0%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	59	89.5%	82.1%	42.9%	9.8%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	91	33.8%	35.4%	28.8%	20.8%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	45	83.8%	88.9%	83.3%	86.4%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	124	61.2%	60.5%	61.0%	59.3%
17	549DT	**Dallas (downtown), TX**	325	21.3%	17.0%	11.1%	6.0%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	41	28.6%	25.0%	20.0%	20.0%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	207	74.9%	74.0%	73.7%	65.6%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	54	52.9%	33.3%	39.0%	19.2%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	83	93.9%	94.4%	70.8%	67.3%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	52	67.4%	72.7%	79.2%	31.3%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	31	61.9%	40.0%	60.0%	17.4%
19	666	**Sheridan, WY**	16	37.5%	37.5%	25.0%	12.5%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	48	78.6%	79.2%	71.4%	71.4%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	72	84.1%	87.5%	91.5%	91.1%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	115	31.1%	24.0%	24.3%	14.8%
20	692	**White City, OR**	171	83.1%	85.2%	72.9%	65.0%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	12	75.0%	75.0%	54.5%	60.0%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	80	58.3%	57.7%	51.6%	39.0%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	14	37.5%	0.0%	46.2%	15.4%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	63	76.9%	70.0%	72.0%	76.9%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	30	72.4%	75.9%	83.3%	76.7%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	92	89.9%	87.1%	73.3%	53.5%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	23	83.3%	78.6%	76.2%	52.6%
23	437	**Fargo, ND**	16	50.0%	21.4%	31.3%	20.0%
23	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	40	55.3%	53.3%	46.7%	50.0%
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	118	85.5%	96.2%	93.3%	91.9%
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	56	74.5%	70.4%	67.6%	11.1%
23	636	**Omaha, NE**	18	11.1%	10.0%	7.7%	0.0%
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	223	66.2%	60.9%	31.3%	12.4%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,078)				**67.1%**	**65.6%**	**56.2%**	**43.1%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=95)				**66.4%**	**64.0%**	**56.3%**	**39.7%**
SITE S.D.				**21.9%**	**24.2%**	**23.7%**	**28.2%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY05: VISN 1, Togus; VISN 10, Columbus; VISN 15; Poplar Bluff; VISN 18, El Paso; and VISN 19, Colorado Springs.

Table 33. Employment Status at Discharge by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Ready for Competitive Employment %	Competitively Employed at Discharge %	Employed in VA's IT %	Student, Trainee or Unpaid Volunteer %	Unemployed %	Retired/ Disabled %	Unknown %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	27	44.4%	51.9%	0.0%	3.7%	14.8%	18.5%	3.7%
1	518	Bedford, MA	258	63.2%	22.9%	0.0%	2.7%	45.0%	8.9%	18.2%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	52.0%	32.0%	0.0%	8.0%	24.0%	20.0%	12.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	119	43.7%	22.7%	0.0%	2.5%	57.1%	7.6%	6.7%
1	631	Northampton, MA	126	46.8%	33.3%	0.0%	3.2%	38.1%	7.1%	14.3%
1	650	Providence, RI	79	21.5%	21.5%	22.8%	5.1%	20.3%	20.3%	10.1%
1	689	West Haven, CT	24	66.7%	29.2%	0.0%	12.5%	33.3%	16.7%	4.2%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	100	64.0%	44.0%	0.0%	5.0%	20.0%	11.0%	8.0%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	31	74.2%	38.7%	3.2%	0.0%	25.8%	0.0%	19.4%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	73	86.3%	15.1%	1.4%	41.1%	42.5%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	47	72.3%	46.8%	0.0%	10.6%	31.9%	6.4%	4.3%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	91	58.2%	53.8%	0.0%	5.5%	25.3%	6.6%	3.3%
3	526	Bronx, NY	126	54.8%	40.5%	0.0%	7.9%	27.8%	18.3%	3.2%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	36	100.0%	66.7%	0.0%	19.4%	0.0%	0.0%	13.9%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	190	90.0%	26.8%	1.6%	0.0%	4.7%	1.1%	2.1%
3	620	Montrose, NY	131	67.9%	43.5%	3.1%	0.8%	26.0%	4.6%	10.7%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	71	42.3%	29.6%	0.0%	4.2%	32.4%	4.2%	19.7%
3	632	Northport, NY	80	35.0%	27.5%	8.8%	2.5%	40.0%	5.0%	7.5%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	75.6%	60.0%	0.0%	8.9%	6.7%	0.0%	8.9%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	277	86.3%	36.1%	1.8%	0.4%	14.4%	3.6%	40.4%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	72	93.1%	47.2%	1.4%	1.4%	41.7%	0.0%	8.3%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	134	68.7%	40.3%	0.0%	4.5%	35.1%	18.7%	0.7%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	49	83.7%	38.8%	2.0%	22.4%	14.3%	10.2%	12.2%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	39	87.2%	28.2%	7.7%	12.8%	7.7%	5.1%	17.9%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	111	72.1%	34.2%	0.9%	0.9%	25.2%	17.1%	6.3%
5	688	Washington, DC	92	77.2%	42.4%	0.0%	2.2%	38.0%	8.7%	5.4%
6	590	Hampton, VA	64	93.8%	57.8%	0.0%	0.0%	32.8%	4.7%	1.6%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	50.0%	54.2%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	4.2%	16.7%
6	652	Richmond, VA	19	42.1%	15.8%	0.0%	5.3%	57.9%	10.5%	10.5%
6	658	Salem, VA	73	57.5%	32.9%	1.4%	2.7%	42.5%	16.4%	1.4%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	136	59.6%	52.2%	0.0%	3.7%	15.4%	10.3%	17.6%
7	509	Augusta, GA	88	55.7%	36.4%	3.4%	5.7%	18.2%	25.0%	9.1%
7	534	Charleston, SC	33	78.8%	66.7%	0.0%	9.1%	9.1%	6.1%	9.1%
7	544	Columbia, SC	186	93.0%	38.7%	0.0%	1.1%	43.5%	10.2%	2.7%
7	557	Dublin, GA	52	73.1%	40.4%	13.5%	1.9%	17.3%	5.8%	11.5%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	138	83.3%	49.3%	2.2%	2.9%	31.2%	5.1%	7.2%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	127	76.4%	49.6%	3.1%	11.0%	7.9%	18.9%	4.7%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	82	69.5%	64.6%	3.7%	2.4%	8.5%	8.5%	11.0%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	85	64.7%	63.5%	0.0%	0.0%	4.7%	7.1%	24.7%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	58	77.6%	53.4%	0.0%	8.6%	10.3%	12.1%	15.5%
8	673	Tampa, FL	111	86.5%	50.5%	0.0%	0.0%	37.8%	1.8%	9.0%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	63	93.7%	88.9%	0.0%	4.8%	1.6%	3.2%	1.6%
9	596	Lexington, KY	19	42.1%	31.6%	0.0%	5.3%	26.3%	0.0%	26.3%
9	603	Louisville, KY	15	53.3%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%	53.3%	0.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	49	77.1%	32.7%	0.0%	10.2%	42.9%	6.1%	8.2%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	93	84.9%	39.8%	2.2%	1.1%	25.8%	5.4%	23.7%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	48	81.3%	45.8%	0.0%	0.0%	31.3%	6.3%	14.6%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	157	80.9%	61.8%	1.3%	0.6%	5.7%	16.6%	5.1%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	169	63.9%	39.6%	0.0%	0.6%	33.7%	14.8%	8.9%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	193	50.3%	35.8%	0.0%	2.6%	30.1%	17.6%	14.0%
10	552	Dayton, OH	25	60.0%	28.0%	12.0%	4.0%	16.0%	8.0%	24.0%
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	37	59.5%	18.9%	0.0%	5.4%	64.9%	5.4%	0.0%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	52	40.4%	30.8%	7.7%	7.7%	21.2%	7.7%	25.0%
11	550	Danville, IL	32	75.0%	59.4%	0.0%	0.0%	18.8%	15.6%	3.1%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	58.7%	39.1%	0.0%	6.5%	32.6%	15.2%	4.3%

Table 33 cont. Employment Status at Discharge by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Ready for Competitive Employment %	Competitively Employed at Discharge %	Employed in VA's IT %	Student, Trainee or Unpaid Volunteer %	Unemployed %	Retired/ Disabled %	Unknown %
12	556	North Chicago, IL	166	84.3%	75.9%	1.2%	1.2%	21.1%	0.0%	0.0%
12	578	Hines, IL	25	32.0%	20.0%	0.0%	4.0%	32.0%	28.0%	8.0%
12	607	Madison, WI	32	25.0%	28.1%	0.0%	0.0%	31.3%	34.4%	6.3%
12	676	Tomah, WI	65	49.2%	27.7%	0.0%	3.1%	30.8%	35.4%	3.1%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	38	42.1%	39.5%	2.6%	0.0%	23.7%	26.3%	7.9%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	87	63.2%	52.9%	0.0%	2.3%	12.6%	13.8%	14.9%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	29	93.1%	37.9%	0.0%	3.4%	31.0%	6.9%	17.2%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	48	37.5%	22.9%	0.0%	0.0%	18.8%	4.2%	29.2%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	124	76.6%	41.9%	0.0%	0.8%	40.3%	2.4%	12.1%
16	580	Houston, TX	222	54.5%	40.1%	1.4%	2.3%	18.9%	18.5%	9.0%
16	586	Jackson, MS	43	70.4%	42.6%	0.0%	1.9%	37.0%	9.3%	7.4%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	125	70.4%	60.8%	0.0%	2.4%	26.4%	1.6%	8.8%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	59	47.5%	15.3%	0.0%	10.2%	39.0%	11.9%	23.7%
17	549	Dallas, TX	91	33.0%	23.1%	0.0%	1.1%	51.6%	9.9%	11.0%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	45	80.0%	44.4%	20.0%	2.2%	13.3%	8.9%	4.4%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	59.7%	42.7%	10.5%	1.6%	13.7%	14.5%	16.1%
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX	325	13.2%	10.2%	0.0%	8.9%	43.4%	8.9%	28.3%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	41	46.3%	34.1%	0.0%	0.0%	14.6%	7.3%	41.5%
17	674	Temple, TX	207	88.4%	50.7%	0.0%	3.9%	35.3%	3.9%	4.8%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	54	61.1%	37.0%	0.0%	7.4%	22.2%	5.6%	27.8%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	83	81.9%	42.2%	1.2%	0.0%	38.6%	14.5%	3.6%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	53.8%	36.5%	0.0%	0.0%	23.1%	17.3%	17.3%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	31	61.3%	54.8%	0.0%	3.2%	19.4%	19.4%	3.2%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	16	62.5%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	50.0%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	48	77.1%	56.3%	0.0%	14.6%	8.3%	10.4%	6.3%
20	648	Portland, OR	72	76.4%	58.3%	0.0%	12.5%	15.3%	4.2%	8.3%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	115	81.7%	46.1%	10.4%	3.5%	15.7%	9.6%	13.9%
20	692	White City, OR	171	69.0%	47.4%	4.1%	7.0%	11.7%	12.3%	14.6%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	12	58.3%	58.3%	0.0%	16.7%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	80	62.5%	47.5%	0.0%	1.3%	35.0%	3.8%	8.8%
21	654	Reno, NV	14	28.6%	35.7%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	57.1%	0.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	63	55.6%	28.6%	0.0%	4.8%	41.3%	14.3%	11.1%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	80.0%	56.7%	6.7%	10.0%	10.0%	13.3%	3.3%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	92	48.9%	42.4%	0.0%	18.5%	6.5%	21.7%	9.8%
22	664	San Diego, CA	23	60.9%	47.8%	0.0%	21.7%	13.0%	8.7%	4.3%
23	437	Fargo, ND	16	56.3%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	18.8%	6.3%
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	40	50.0%	27.5%	5.0%	5.0%	22.5%	5.0%	30.0%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	118	96.6%	44.1%	0.8%	3.4%	19.5%	9.3%	20.3%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	56	69.6%	50.0%	0.0%	5.4%	8.9%	12.5%	21.4%
23	636	Omaha, NE	18	44.4%	44.4%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	223	70.0%	32.7%	4.9%	0.9%	40.4%	9.4%	10.8%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,078)				**66.0%**	**40.6%**	**1.7%**	**4.2%**	**26.5%**	**10.1%**	**12.1%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=96)				**64.4%**	**41.2%**	**1.8%**	**5.0%**	**24.7%**	**11.4%**	**11.6%**
SITE S.D.				**18.5%**	**14.3%**	**4.0%**	**6.2%**	**13.7%**	**9.9%**	**9.5%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY05:   VISN 1, Togus; VISN 10, Columbus; VISN 15; Poplar Bluff, VISN 18, El Paso; and VISN 19, Colorado Springs.

Table 34. Housing Status at Discharge by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Housed†† %	Transitional Housing or Halfway House %	Hospital, Nursing Home or Domiciliary %	Homeless / Unknown %	Other %
1	405	White River Junction, VT	27	96.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%
1	518	Bedford, MA	258	36.0%	16.3%	8.5%	36.8%	2.3%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	80.0%	4.0%	8.0%	4.0%	4.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	119	40.3%	31.9%	5.0%	21.8%	0.8%
1	631	Northampton, MA	126	31.7%	22.2%	7.9%	38.1%	0.0%
1	650	Providence, RI	79	78.5%	11.4%	0.0%	10.1%	0.0%
1	689	West Haven, CT	24	45.8%	29.2%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	100	83.0%	7.0%	1.0%	5.0%	4.0%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	31	48.4%	35.5%	3.2%	12.9%	0.0%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	73	49.3%	45.2%	1.4%	4.1%	0.0%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	47	68.1%	29.8%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	91	65.9%	17.6%	2.2%	14.3%	0.0%
3	526	Bronx, NY	126	59.5%	16.7%	3.2%	17.5%	3.2%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	36	97.2%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	190	21.6%	13.7%	61.6%	2.6%	0.5%
3	620	Montrose, NY	131	55.7%	3.8%	20.6%	15.3%	4.6%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	71	40.8%	28.2%	1.4%	26.8%	2.8%
3	632	Northport, NY	80	32.5%	27.5%	15.0%	17.5%	7.5%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	55.6%	22.2%	13.3%	8.9%	0.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	277	17.3%	18.4%	25.3%	37.9%	1.1%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	72	38.9%	43.1%	8.3%	9.7%	0.0%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	134	59.0%	21.6%	14.2%	2.2%	3.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	49	61.2%	32.7%	4.1%	2.0%	0.0%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	39	41.0%	35.9%	0.0%	12.8%	10.3%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	111	32.4%	17.1%	37.8%	12.6%	0.0%
5	688	Washington, DC	92	54.3%	33.7%	3.3%	7.6%	1.1%
6	590	Hampton, VA	64	42.2%	37.5%	7.8%	10.9%	1.6%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	33.3%	8.3%	0.0%	58.3%	0.0%
6	652	Richmond, VA	19	68.4%	31.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	658	Salem, VA	73	62.5%	5.6%	12.5%	18.1%	1.4%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	136	31.6%	37.5%	1.5%	28.7%	0.7%
7	509	Augusta, GA	88	84.1%	4.5%	2.3%	8.0%	1.1%
7	534	Charleston, SC	33	66.7%	15.2%	0.0%	18.2%	0.0%
7	544	Columbia, SC	186	72.0%	9.1%	3.2%	12.4%	3.2%
7	557	Dublin, GA	52	55.8%	5.8%	30.8%	7.7%	0.0%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	138	88.4%	3.6%	2.2%	5.8%	0.0%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	127	80.3%	4.7%	5.5%	5.5%	3.9%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	82	48.8%	8.5%	28.0%	12.2%	2.4%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	85	42.4%	32.9%	0.0%	24.7%	0.0%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	58	70.7%	13.8%	0.0%	15.5%	0.0%
8	673	Tampa, FL	111	46.8%	15.3%	0.0%	37.8%	0.0%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	63	77.8%	19.0%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%
9	596	Lexington, KY	19	47.4%	10.5%	5.3%	21.1%	15.8%
9	603	Louisville, KY	15	40.0%	33.3%	20.0%	0.0%	6.7%
9	614	Memphis, TN	49	55.1%	26.5%	0.0%	18.4%	0.0%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	93	54.8%	3.2%	15.1%	26.9%	0.0%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	48	54.2%	25.0%	0.0%	18.8%	2.1%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	157	42.7%	1.9%	48.4%	3.2%	3.8%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	169	55.0%	13.0%	7.7%	20.7%	3.6%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	193	67.9%	5.7%	3.6%	22.8%	0.0%
10	552	Dayton, OH	25	72.0%	0.0%	4.0%	20.0%	4.0%

Table 34 cont. Housing Status at Discharge by Site for FY05 †

VISN		SITE	N	Housed†† %	Transitional Housing or Halfway House %	Hospital, Nursing Home or Domiciliary %	Homeless / Unknown %	Other %
11	506	**Ann Arbor, MI**	37	73.0%	13.5%	0.0%	10.8%	2.7%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	52	67.3%	3.8%	5.8%	21.2%	1.9%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	32	78.1%	3.1%	9.4%	6.3%	3.1%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	46	56.5%	30.4%	0.0%	10.9%	2.2%
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	166	19.9%	21.7%	53.6%	4.2%	0.6%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	25	84.0%	8.0%	0.0%	4.0%	4.0%
12	607	**Madison, WI**	32	75.0%	15.6%	3.1%	3.1%	3.1%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	65	50.8%	30.8%	4.6%	13.8%	0.0%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	38	89.5%	2.6%	2.6%	5.3%	0.0%
15	589	**Kansas City, MO**	87	50.6%	18.4%	11.5%	17.2%	2.3%
15	589A5	**Topeka, KS**	29	62.1%	0.0%	0.0%	31.0%	6.9%
15	589A6	**Leavenworth, KS**	48	16.7%	33.3%	27.1%	22.9%	0.0%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	124	69.4%	2.4%	13.7%	11.3%	3.2%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	222	52.3%	28.8%	2.7%	10.8%	5.4%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	43	46.3%	24.1%	0.0%	27.8%	1.9%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	125	39.2%	14.4%	38.4%	8.0%	0.0%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	59	49.2%	6.8%	11.9%	28.8%	3.4%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	91	65.9%	4.4%	2.2%	24.2%	3.3%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	45	62.2%	6.7%	26.7%	4.4%	0.0%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	124	54.0%	5.6%	12.9%	26.6%	0.8%
17	549DT	**Dallas (downtown), TX**	325	28.0%	6.5%	13.8%	50.8%	0.9%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	41	48.8%	7.3%	2.4%	36.6%	4.9%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	207	58.0%	2.9%	8.2%	29.5%	1.4%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	54	50.0%	11.1%	3.7%	33.3%	1.9%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	83	42.2%	22.9%	13.3%	21.7%	0.0%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	52	48.1%	23.1%	0.0%	21.2%	7.7%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	31	67.7%	12.9%	0.0%	19.4%	0.0%
19	666	**Sheridan, WY**	16	18.8%	6.3%	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	48	75.0%	10.4%	4.2%	8.3%	2.1%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	72	80.6%	5.6%	0.0%	13.9%	0.0%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	115	60.9%	13.9%	8.7%	15.7%	0.9%
20	692	**White City, OR**	171	35.1%	9.9%	35.7%	18.1%	1.2%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	12	83.3%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	80	70.0%	5.0%	0.0%	23.8%	1.3%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	14	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	63	41.3%	41.3%	0.0%	17.5%	0.0%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	30	73.3%	20.0%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	92	76.1%	3.3%	0.0%	18.5%	2.2%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	23	87.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	8.7%
23	437	**Fargo, ND**	16	75.0%	6.3%	0.0%	18.8%	0.0%
23	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	40	57.5%	15.0%	0.0%	27.5%	0.0%
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	118	54.2%	15.3%	8.5%	21.2%	0.8%
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	56	58.9%	1.8%	21.4%	17.9%	0.0%
23	636	**Omaha, NE**	18	55.6%	33.3%	5.6%	5.6%	0.0%
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	223	53.4%	4.9%	28.3%	13.0%	0.4%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=8,078)				**52.3%**	**14.9%**	**12.6%**	**18.5%**	**1.7%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=96)				**57.4%**	**15.7%**	**8.9%**	**16.2%**	**1.9%**
SITE S.D.				**18.7%**	**12.0%**	**12.6%**	**12.0%**	**2.6%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY05: VISN 1, Togus; VISN 10, Columbus; VISN 15, Poplar Bluff; VISN 18, El Paso; and VISN 19, Colorado Springs.

†† Includes own apartment, room or house; apartment, room or house of friend or family member.

Table 35. Percent and Direction From Median Performance of CWT/VI Sites: Critical Outcome Monitor Measures for FY05 †, ††, †††, ††††

| | | | | | Site Median Value | 1.70 | 73.6% | 67.2% | 55.2% | 40.0% | 38.7% | 25.3% | 8.8% |
| | | | | | Veteran Average | 1.63 | 67.1% | 65.6% | 56.2% | 43.1% | 40.6% | 26.5% | 12.1% |

VISN	SITE	SITE	#VETS	AVERAGE WORK IMPROVEMENT	ALCOHOL PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	DRUG PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	MEDICAL PROBLEMS IMPROVED†††† %	COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE %	UNEMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE %	EMPLOYMENT STATUS UNKNOWN AT DISCHARGE %
1	518	Bedford, MA	258	-0.52	-56.1%	-38.7%	-44.9%	-21.0%	-11.0%	20.1%	9.8%
1	523	Boston, MA	25	0.02	-21.5%	-17.3%	-37.3%	0.0%	-2.2%	-1.4%	4.4%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	119	0.11	0.0%	8.1%	-0.4%	-5.8%	-13.7%	33.6%	-2.6%
1	631	Northampton, MA	126	0.11	-6.2%	10.2%	13.7%	30.8%	-4.4%	13.7%	5.3%
1	650	Providence, RI	79	-0.44	-45.5%	-38.7%	-34.3%	-26.2%	-1.7%	-1.7%	4.9%
1	689	West Haven, CT	24	-0.07	16.5%	29.0%	-7.6%	-3.5%	-2.4%	8.6%	-3.3%
1	405	White River Junction	27	0.17	38.5%	33.7%	39.9%	19.9%	20.5%	-7.3%	-2.2%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	91	-0.27	-29.9%	-17.8%	-43.4%	-32.7%	15.4%	0.0%	-4.8%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	73	0.11	21.0%	32.1%	41.2%	62.9%	-29.5%	18.2%	-8.9%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	100	-0.43	-24.2%	-28.4%	-6.4%	-28.5%	5.6%	-4.6%	0.7%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	31	-0.33	6.2%	9.1%	-82.6%	-9.9%	-6.1%	-0.5%	11.8%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	47	-0.08	16.2%	16.9%	0.2%	-2.7%	7.6%	8.1%	-3.0%
3	526	Bronx, NY	126	-0.12	7.9%	-19.9%	-28.5%	-61.9%	3.3%	2.4%	-5.1%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	71	-0.40	-46.8%	-35.9%	-32.0%	-14.7%	-1.8%	5.5%	11.5%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	36	0.27	27.0%	41.3%	55.0%	-10.8%	25.8%	-24.6%	5.8%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	190	0.24	33.7%	43.0%	43.9%	56.9%	-17.2%	-18.7%	-6.6%
3	620	Montrose, NY	131	-0.47	-37.6%	-28.8%	-49.2%	-31.5%	-0.9%	2.2%	1.7%
3	632	Northport, NY	80	-0.30	-30.4%	-15.0%	-16.8%	-10.1%	-10.1%	15.5%	-1.0%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	-0.40	19.1%	29.8%	-20.7%	-17.1%	17.3%	-17.2%	0.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	277	0.07	29.2%	40.2%	27.5%	41.4%	-4.7%	-9.9%	31.0%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	72	0.25	38.0%	46.8%	43.5%	32.1%	5.0%	16.7%	-0.5%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	134	0.14	19.9%	24.6%	22.8%	-22.9%	-1.3%	11.7%	-7.4%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	49	0.17	-23.9%	-19.4%	-17.0%	-17.5%	1.7%	-9.8%	4.8%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	111	0.09	9.2%	22.3%	13.0%	37.8%	-5.5%	2.1%	-1.5%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	39	-0.27	23.0%	23.4%	29.3%	-21.4%	-8.1%	-17.5%	10.6%
5	688	Washington, DC	92	0.06	-1.4%	0.0%	17.1%	19.3%	5.9%	13.4%	-2.5%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	-0.24	-40.5%	-60.3%	-18.4%	-4.8%	14.4%	1.0%	7.4%
6	590	Hampton, VA	64	0.20	12.0%	22.7%	-11.0%	-18.8%	12.7%	9.7%	-7.0%
6	652	Richmond, VA	19	-0.32	-74.7%	-54.8%	-59.6%	-65.4%	-19.1%	34.6%	2.9%
6	658	Salem, VA	73	0.19	-0.9%	25.3%	29.3%	8.9%	-8.8%	19.0%	-7.7%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	136	-0.19	-18.5%	-5.6%	0.0%	4.9%	8.6%	-8.6%	9.2%
7	509	Augusta, GA	88	0.01	-4.5%	-2.6%	10.6%	-29.3%	1.6%	-5.2%	2.5%
7	534	Charleston, SC	33	0.21	10.9%	23.4%	32.1%	67.6%	23.1%	-14.9%	-0.1%
7	544	Columbia, SC	186	-0.47	-45.6%	-35.8%	-17.3%	-11.0%	0.0%	19.8%	-5.2%
7	557	Dublin, GA	52	0.15	-1.4%	16.7%	26.5%	40.8%	-4.3%	-7.9%	5.1%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	127	-0.08	-0.3%	11.6%	8.6%	18.3%	13.5%	-15.7%	-3.4%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	138	0.33	39.2%	44.7%	52.1%	73.5%	11.7%	6.1%	-1.0%

Table 35 cont. Percent and Direction From Median Performance of CWT/VI Sites: Critical Outcome Monitor Measures for FY05 †, ††, †††, ††††

					ALCOHOL PROBLEMS IMPROVED††††	DRUG PROBLEMS IMPROVED††††	MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS IMPROVED††††	MEDICAL PROBLEMS IMPROVED††††	COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE	UNEMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE	EMPLOYMENT STATUS UNKNOWN AT DISCHARGE
Site Median Value				1.70	73.6%	67.2%	55.2%	40.0%	38.7%	25.3%	8.8%
Veteran Average				1.63	67.1%	65.6%	56.2%	43.1%	40.6%	26.5%	12.1%
VISN	SITE	SITE	#VETS	AVERAGE WORK IMPROVEMENT	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	82	0.03	16.0%	12.1%	3.7%	16.6%	21.7%	-15.7%	3.3%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	58	-0.05	9.2%	1.7%	-0.7%	-24.7%	13.7%	-13.0%	7.6%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	63	0.29	36.4%	46.5%	47.7%	-59.0%	44.5%	-21.6%	-9.0%
8	673	Tampa, FL	111	0.07	24.7%	37.7%	-8.9%	-12.7%	5.5%	15.1%	0.3%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	85	-0.16	-15.1%	-8.9%	-4.9%	-6.4%	16.9%	-18.0%	16.3%
9	596	Lexington, KY	19	-0.42	-61.5%	-59.7%	-33.9%	-35.0%	-8.6%	-0.5%	18.0%
9	603	Louisville, KY	15	0.02	11.0%	23.2%	-25.7%	-37.3%	-4.6%	-15.6%	-8.2%
9	614	Memphis, TN	49	0.02	-6.9%	15.4%	2.7%	48.7%	-6.7%	19.0%	1.0%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	93	0.16	16.2%	25.5%	22.3%	49.0%	-5.1%	2.8%	15.6%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	48	-0.13	-15.1%	-10.7%	-43.4%	-35.7%	4.7%	8.4%	6.1%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	157	0.25	33.8%	44.3%	47.9%	21.5%	21.2%	-17.4%	-3.4%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	169	0.06	3.1%	15.8%	20.2%	35.0%	-1.8%	10.9%	0.0%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	193	0.20	18.7%	30.3%	17.1%	20.1%	-3.1%	5.1%	5.4%
10	552	Dayton, OH	25	-0.21	-24.8%	-22.1%	16.5%	24.9%	-13.7%	-8.2%	16.8%
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	37	-0.72	-53.0%	-48.8%	-44.5%	-26.4%	-15.4%	39.2%	-6.8%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	52	-0.10	-47.6%	-32.4%	-18.6%	-1.9%	-9.6%	-2.6%	15.3%
11	550	Danville, IL	32	-0.01	7.6%	-23.3%	18.3%	17.7%	22.6%	-6.2%	-6.6%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	-0.23	-18.1%	-3.5%	-12.0%	-11.1%	0.6%	9.9%	-2.9%
12	578	Hines, IL	25	-0.31	-41.3%	-21.4%	-54.9%	-8.7%	-16.2%	9.5%	0.4%
12	607	Madison	32	-0.13	-1.4%	29.1%	-5.3%	-44.8%	-3.5%	7.3%	-0.9%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	38	0.06	5.8%	12.1%	6.9%	5.1%	-0.8%	-0.5%	-0.5%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	166	0.19	24.2%	25.8%	15.3%	50.6%	32.3%	-2.9%	-8.6%
12	676	Tomah, WI	65	0.01	17.6%	4.5%	2.3%	44.4%	-8.9%	7.8%	-5.0%
15	589	Kansas City	87	0.03	-22.1%	-12.2%	-5.7%	25.0%	11.2%	-12.9%	6.2%
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	48	0.18	6.8%	14.5%	8.1%	40.8%	-20.1%	-7.1%	22.1%
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	29	-0.29	-14.9%	-24.6%	-31.9%	-47.1%	0.6%	6.8%	8.9%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	124	0.00	-12.8%	8.3%	-3.6%	16.5%	-0.3%	15.7%	3.7%
16	580	Houston, TX	222	0.07	-4.9%	-2.7%	6.7%	7.1%	1.9%	-5.6%	0.7%
16	586	Jackson, MS	43	-0.64	-32.1%	-15.1%	-11.0%	-15.9%	4.2%	14.8%	-0.5%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	125	-0.44	-18.0%	-14.0%	-30.2%	-36.2%	15.3%	3.1%	0.0%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	59	-0.18	17.8%	16.4%	-31.0%	-32.1%	-24.2%	15.0%	15.9%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	45	0.22	16.1%	30.0%	32.9%	52.5%	0.6%	-10.3%	-4.2%
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX	325	-0.57	-45.3%	-58.7%	-58.3%	-29.6%	-28.6%	19.4%	18.6%
17	549	Dallas, TX	91	-0.24	-42.5%	-50.3%	-37.0%	-13.1%	-15.5%	26.6%	2.5%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	-0.02	-0.5%	8.3%	16.1%	34.3%	6.6%	-10.5%	7.1%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	41	-0.28	-54.9%	-52.6%	-72.9%	-27.4%	-6.2%	-9.1%	33.9%
17	674	Temple, TX	207	0.08	2.2%	8.4%	16.7%	32.3%	9.7%	11.4%	-2.9%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	54	-0.26	-43.7%	-73.1%	-24.8%	-11.1%	-3.0%	-4.2%	19.8%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	83	0.05	26.8%	34.1%	6.6%	25.4%	0.5%	15.7%	-3.8%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	-0.12	-10.6%	2.0%	27.0%	-30.0%	-3.8%	0.1%	9.8%

Table 35 cont. Percent and Direction From Median Performance of CWT/VI Sites: Critical Outcome Monitor Measures for FY05 †, ††, †††, ††††

					ALCOHOL PROBLEMS IMPROVED††††	DRUG PROBLEMS IMPROVED††††	MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS IMPROVED††††	MEDICAL PROBLEMS IMPROVED††††	COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE	UNEMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE	EMPLOYMENT STATUS UNKNOWN AT DISCHARGE
Site Median Value				1.70	73.6%	67.2%	55.2%	40.0%	38.7%	25.3%	8.8%
Veteran Average				1.63	67.1%	65.6%	56.2%	43.1%	40.6%	26.5%	12.1%
VISN	SITE	SITE	#VETS	AVERAGE WORK IMPROVEMENT	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	31	-0.02	-17.6%	-32.4%	-3.4%	-21.0%	15.0%	-3.5%	-4.8%
19	666	**Sheridan, WY**	16	**-0.42**	**-39.8%**	-20.1%	-27.0%	-12.8%	-22.2%	-24.5%	**39.7%**
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	115	**-0.71**	**-48.6%**	**-37.4%**	**-35.0%**	-22.1%	7.1%	-8.0%	6.3%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	48	0.13	7.4%	17.7%	5.9%	39.8%	17.6%	-16.3%	-1.3%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	72	0.24	12.7%	22.6%	38.6%	59.0%	17.1%	-9.5%	0.8%
20	692	**White City, OR**	171	0.03	10.8%	24.8%	16.2%	29.7%	8.2%	-12.6%	6.7%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	12	0.01	2.2%	-1.0%	-8.5%	26.7%	22.4%	1.6%	-6.4%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	80	-0.07	**-22.4%**	-8.6%	-6.4%	0.0%	7.7%	11.2%	0.0%
21	654	**Reno**	14	**-0.53**	**-71.2%**	**-100.4%**	-25.3%	-15.4%	11.1%	-12.7%	-4.1%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	63	-0.04	-2.1%	-4.2%	11.1%	46.0%	-4.8%	**16.3%**	3.4%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	92	0.22	20.1%	25.2%	7.0%	17.3%	8.6%	-17.3%	1.3%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	30	0.25	5.7%	20.2%	35.0%	53.9%	21.6%	-11.1%	-3.0%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	23	0.08	12.8%	15.2%	19.2%	25.6%	17.8%	-12.3%	-2.9%
23	437	**Fargo, ND**	16	0.02	-15.7%	-30.0%	-15.1%	-12.8%	11.3%	2.4%	-1.7%
23	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	40	**-0.28**	**-41.8%**	-32.1%	**-29.3%**	4.7%	-9.4%	-1.1%	**21.7%**
23	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	118	0.18	8.2%	37.1%	42.4%	62.9%	3.9%	-3.8%	**11.7%**
23	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	56	0.02	13.0%	18.7%	19.9%	**-28.9%**	10.9%	-14.9%	**14.3%**
23	636	**Omaha, NE**	18	**-0.45**	**-73.9%**	**-83.0%**	**-70.4%**	-27.0%	6.0%	-8.3%	8.0%
23	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	223	**-0.14**	-1.9%	4.0%	**-19.0%**	-21.8%	-3.5%	**16.5%**	2.4%

† Outcomes have been adjusted for the following veteran characteristics: Age, race, marital status, education, previous employment history, receipt of disability benefits, history of psychiatric hospitalizations, and clinical psychiatric diagnoses; including serious psychiatric illness and substance abuse problems.

†† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY04: VISN 1, Togus; VISN 10, Columbus; VISN 15, Poplar Bluff; VISN 18, El Paso; and VISN 19, Colorado Springs.

††† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

†††† Only veterans with a problem in the clinical area were included in this analysis.

Table 36. Summary of Outliers by Site for FY05

VISN		SITE	N	VETERAN CHARACTERISTIC CRITICAL MONITOR	PROGRAM PARTICIPATION CRITICAL MONITORS	ADJUSTED OUTCOME MONITORS	TOTAL NUMBER OF OUTLIERS
1	518	Bedford, MA	258	0	2	7	9
1	523	Boston, MA	25	0	0	1	1
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	119	0	2	2	4
1	631	Northampton, MA	126	0	0	1	1
1	650	Providence, RI	79	0	1	5	6
1	689	West Haven, CT	24	0	1	0	1
1	405	White River Junction, VT	27	0	0	0	0
2	528A8	Albany, NY	91	0	1	4	5
2	528A6	Bath, NY	73	0	0	2	2
2	528	Buffalo, NY	100	0	0	4	4
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	31	0	0	2	2
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	47	0	0	0	0
3	526	Bronx, NY	126	0	0	3	3
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	71	0	1	5	6
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	36	1	0	0	1
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	190	1	0	1	2
3	620	Montrose, NY	131	0	0	5	5
3	632	Northport, NY	80	0	1	3	4
4	529	Butler, PA	45	0	0	1	1
4	542	Coatesville, PA	277	0	1	1	2
4	595	Lebanon, PA	72	1	0	1	2
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	134	1	0	1	2
5	512	Baltimore, MD	49	0	0	0	0
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	111	0	0	0	0
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	39	0	0	1	1
5	688	Washington, DC	92	0	0	1	1
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	0	0	3	3
6	590	Hampton, VA	64	1	1	0	2
6	652	Richmond, VA	19	0	2	6	8
6	658	Salem, VA	73	1	0	1	2
7	508	Atlanta, GA	136	0	0	3	3
7	509	Augusta, GA	88	0	0	1	1
7	534	Charleston, SC	33	0	0	0	0
7	544	Columbia, SC	186	0	2	4	6
7	557	Dublin, GA	52	0	0	0	0
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	127	0	0	0	0
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	138	0	0	0	0
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	82	0	0	0	0
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	58	0	0	0	0
8	673OR	Orlando, FL	63	1	0	0	1
8	673	Tampa, FL	111	1	0	1	2
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	85	1	0	2	3
9	596	Lexington, KY	19	0	1	4	5
9	603	Louisville, KY	15	0	0	1	1
9	614	Memphis, TN	49	0	0	1	1
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	93	0	1	1	2
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	48	0	0	2	2
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	157	1	1	0	2
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	169	0	2	0	2
10	541	Cleveland, OH	193	0	0	0	0
10	552	Dayton, OH	25	1	0	2	3

Table 36 cont. Summary of Outliers by Site for FY05

VISN		SITE	N	VETERAN CHARACTERISTIC CRITICAL MONITOR	PROGRAM PARTICIPATION CRITICAL MONITORS	ADJUSTED OUTCOME MONITORS	TOTAL NUMBER OF OUTLIERS
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	37	0	1	5	6
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	52	0	0	3	3
11	550	Danville, IL	32	0	1	0	1
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	46	0	0	1	1
12	578	Hines, IL	25	0	1	3	4
12	607	Madison, WI	32	0	2	1	3
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	38	0	2	0	2
12	556	North Chicago, IL	166	1	0	0	1
12	676	Tomah, WI	65	0	1	0	1
15	589	Kansas City, MO	87	0	0	1	1
15	589A6	Leavenworth, KS	48	0	0	2	2
15	589A5	Topeka, KS	29	0	1	2	3
16	520	Biloxi, MS	124	0	0	1	1
16	580	Houston, TX	222	0	0	0	0
16	586	Jackson, MS	43	0	0	3	3
16	598	Little Rock, AR	125	1	0	4	5
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	59	0	2	6	8
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	45	0	0	0	0
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX	325	0	3	8	11
17	549	Dallas, TX	91	0	2	6	8
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	124	1	2	0	3
17	671	San Antonio, TX	41	0	1	5	6
17	674	Temple, TX	207	0	1	1	2
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	54	0	1	4	5
18	649	Prescott, AZ	83	0	0	1	1
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	0	0	1	1
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	31	0	0	0	0
19	666	Sheridan, WY	16	0	0	3	3
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	115	0	1	4	5
20	463	Anchorage, AK	48	0	0	0	0
20	648	Portland, OR	72	0	0	0	0
20	692	White City, OR	171	0	0	0	0
21	459	Honolulu, HI	12	0	1	0	1
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	80	1	0	1	2
21	654	Reno, NV	14	0	2	3	5
21	662	San Francisco, CA	63	0	0	1	1
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	92	0	0	0	0
22	600	Long Beach, CA	30	1	0	0	1
22	664	San Diego, CA	23	0	1	0	1
23	437	Fargo, ND	16	0	0	0	0
23	568	Ft. Meade, SD	40	0	1	4	5
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	118	0	1	1	2
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	56	0	0	2	2
23	636	Omaha, NE	18	0	2	4	6
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	223	0	0	3	3
TOTAL				16	50	167	233
SITE AVERAGE (N=96)				0.2	0.5	1.7	2.4
SITE S.D.				0.4	0.8	1.9	2.3

Table 37a. Adjusted Average Work Improvement, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Average Work Improvement	FY98 Average Work Improvement	FY99 Average Work Improvement	FY00 Average Work Improvement	FY01 Average Work Improvement	FY02 Average Work Improvement	FY03 Average Work Improvement	FY04 Average Work Improvement	FY05 Average Work Improvement
1	518	Bedford, MA	-0.41	-0.39	-0.27	-0.34	-0.43	-0.49	-0.46	-0.43	-0.52
1	523	Boston, MA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-0.23	-0.16	0.09	-0.28	0.06	0.02
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	0.18	0.08	-0.05	-0.21	-0.43	-0.36	0.02	0.11	0.11
1	608	Manchester, NH	-0.43	***	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed
1	631	Northampton, MA	0.03	0.09	0.03	0.07	0.22	0.29	0.14	0.24	0.11
1	650	Providence, RI	-0.12	-0.08	-0.09	0.08	0.24	-0.42	-0.51	-0.62	-0.44
1	689	West Haven, CT	-0.01	-0.11	0.21	-0.04	0.06	-0.46	-0.35	0.00	-0.07
1	405	White River Jnct., VT	n.a.	***	***	program closed	***	***	0.03	0.03	0.17
2	528A8	Albany, NY	-0.34	-0.22	-0.09	0.04	-0.11	-0.25	-0.24	-0.13	-0.27
2	528A6	Bath, NY	0.48	0.42	0.39	0.19	0.22	0.32	-0.03	0.19	0.11
2	528	Buffalo, NY	-0.42	-0.50	-0.54	-0.47	-0.41	-0.30	-0.29	-0.43	-0.43
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	0.00	-0.19	-0.01	0.08	-0.02	0.00	0.15	0.18	-0.33
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	0.08	0.03	-0.24	0.00	-0.44	-0.51	-0.37	-0.21	-0.08
3	526	Bronx, NY	0.01	0.42	0.07	0.15	0.08	-0.10	-0.13	-0.05	-0.12
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	n.a.	-0.08	-0.10	-0.23	-0.38	-0.20	-0.20	-0.42	-0.40
3	561A	East Orange, NJ	-0.08	0.23	see above	see above	0.30	0.28	-0.19	-0.26	0.27
3	561B	Lyons, NJ	0.12	0.28	see above	see above	0.32	0.32	0.26	0.32	0.24
3	620	Montrose, NY	-0.35	-0.10	-0.16	-0.11	-0.39	-0.45	-0.48	-0.43	-0.47
3	561	New Jersey HCS	see below	see below	-0.01	0.01	see below	see below	see below	see below	see below
3	632	Northport, NY	0.08	0.23	0.10	***	-0.22	-0.01	-0.25	-0.42	-0.30
4	529	Butler, PA	***	0.24	0.36	0.37	0.29	0.34	0.18	0.07	-0.40
4	542	Coatesville, PA	0.04	0.24	0.31	0.27	0.26	0.24	0.23	0.22	0.07
4	595	Lebanon, PA	0.07	0.00	0.10	0.17	0.25	0.29	0.18	0.26	0.25
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	***	0.46	0.46	0.42	0.39	0.40	program closed	program closed	program closed
4	656A5	Pittsburgh, PA	-0.59	-0.14	0.05	0.13	0.19	0.23	0.23	0.25	0.14
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	-0.20	-0.01	-0.07	***
5	512	Baltimore, MD	***	0.17	0.32	-0.03	0.29	0.06	0.00	0.25	0.17
5	512A4	Fort Howard, MD	n.a.	***	0.02	0.08	***	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	n.a.	***	-0.08	0.01	0.20	0.26	0.06	0.17	0.09
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	0.10	-0.12	0.25	***	-0.07	0.12	0.05	0.03	-0.27
5	688	Washington DC	-0.54	-0.31	-0.13	-0.28	-0.16	-0.10	-0.20	-0.11	0.06
6	637	Asheville, NC	***	***	***	***	-0.05	-0.04	0.18	-0.32	-0.24
6	558	Durham, NC	0.02	0.03	-0.02	0.23	0.25	***	program closed	program closed	program closed
6	590	Hampton, VA	0.18	-0.06	0.11	0.11	0.24	0.27	0.21	0.23	0.20
6	652	Richmond, VA	-0.30	-0.28	-0.01	program closed	***	-0.52	-0.10	0.04	-0.32
6	658	Salem, VA	-0.36	-0.62	0.16	0.28	0.33	0.21	0.29	0.34	0.19
6	659	Salisbury, NC	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	***	***
7	508	Atlanta, GA	0.16	-0.23	-0.37	-0.26	-0.32	-0.09	-0.19	-0.18	-0.19
7	509	Augusta, GA	-0.01	-0.02	0.08	0.07	0.09	0.12	0.08	0.06	0.01
7	521	Birmingham, AL	n.a.	n.a.	0.38	0.25	0.24	0.19	0.17	0.30	***
7	534	Charleston, SC	-0.21	0.09	0.00	0.05	0.05	0.12	0.16	0.23	0.21
7	544	Columbia, SC	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	-0.22	-0.37	-0.44	-0.47
7	557	Dublin, GA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.09	***	0.31	0.26	0.21	0.15
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	-0.05	0.11	0.02	0.11	0.11	0.09	0.11	0.09	-0.08
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-0.24	-0.08	0.37	0.38	0.33

Table 37a cont. Adjusted Average Work Improvement, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Average Work Improvement	FY98 Average Work Improvement	FY99 Average Work Improvement	FY00 Average Work Improvement	FY01 Average Work Improvement	FY02 Average Work Improvement	FY03 Average Work Improvement	FY04 Average Work Improvement	FY05 Average Work Improvement
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	-0.12	0.34	0.30	-0.05	-0.06	-0.09	-0.07	-0.01	0.03
8	573A	Gainesville, FL	***	0.27	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	573B	Lake City, FL	***	0.13	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	546	Miami, FL	0.13	0.15	0.14	0.13	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.16	***
8	573	N.FL/S.GA VHS	*see below*	*see below*	0.29	0.07	0.14	0.16	0.05	0.09	-0.05
8	673OR	Orlando, FL								0.33	0.29
8	673	Tampa, FL	0.00	0.07	-0.03	0.02	**-0.46**	**-0.34**	-0.04	0.10	0.07
8	548	W. Palm Beach, FL	*n.a.*	***	**-0.34**	**-0.24**	-0.09	-0.18	-0.08	0.02	**-0.16**
9	596	Lexington, KY†††	**-0.39**	**-0.45**	**-0.57**	**-0.44**	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	**-0.42**
9	603	Louisville, KY	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	0.02
9	614	Memphis, TN	***	0.24	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.21	-0.09	-0.13	0.02
9	621	Mt. Home, TN	-0.03	0.10	0.08	0.02	0.24	0.30	0.18	0.25	0.16
9	622	Murfreesboro, TN	**-0.43**	**-0.48**	**-0.48**	**-0.44**	**-0.49**	**-0.35**	**-0.34**	**-0.25**	-0.13
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	0.00	0.02	**-0.20**	**-0.25**	**-0.31**	0.27	0.22	0.22	0.25
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	0.31	0.17	0.01	0.17	0.06
10	541	Cleveland, OH	0.28	0.13	0.09	0.21	0.25	0.24	0.25	0.26	0.20
10	756	Columbus, OH								***	***
10	552	Dayton, OH	**-0.54**	***	-0.15	**-0.32**	***	-0.08	0.02	***	**-0.21**
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***	**-0.65**	**-0.29**	**-0.42**	**-0.72**
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	-0.07	-0.05	**-0.17**	**-0.21**	**-0.22**	**-0.40**	**-0.32**	-0.10	-0.10
11	550	Danville, IL	-0.16	***	-0.10	**-0.26**	**-0.24**	-0.03	0.06	-0.12	-0.01
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	*n.a.*	0.24	-0.18	-0.19	-0.19	**-0.25**	**-0.24**	**-0.19**	**-0.23**
12	578	Hines, IL	-0.14	**-0.59**	**-0.34**	**-0.28**	**-0.19**	-0.12	-0.12	-0.07	**-0.31**
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
12	607	Madison, WI	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-0.08	0.06	-0.13
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	**-0.29**	0.02	0.10	-0.07	-0.03	0.01	**-0.16**	0.17	0.06
12	556	North Chicago, IL	-0.06	***	0.27	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.25	0.31	0.19
12	676	Tomah, WI	-0.11	0.02	0.07	**-0.59**	0.28	0.17	0.20	0.10	0.01
15	543	Columbia, MO	***	***	**-0.78**	***	***	***	***	-0.01	***
15	589	Kansas City, KS	**-0.29**	0.39	0.43	0.41	***	***	0.07	0.03	0.03
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	-0.13	**-0.40**	0.24	0.21	0.28	0.22	0.05	0.31	0.18
15	647	Poplar Bluff, MO	***	-0.07	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
15	657	St. Louis, MO	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***	***
15	677	Topeka, KS	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	-0.19	**-0.38**	**-0.44**	**-0.35**	**-0.29**
16	520	Biloxi, MI	-0.16	-0.07	-0.09	-0.01	-0.11	-0.09	0.02	0.05	0.00
16	580	Houston, TX	**-0.40**	0.32	0.26	0.27	0.21	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.07
16	586	Jackson, MS	***	-0.05	-0.05	0.17	0.05	**-0.38**	**-0.47**	**-0.56**	**-0.64**
16	598	Little Rock, AR	**-0.68**	**-0.19**	**-0.28**	**-0.31**	**-0.14**	**-0.15**	**-0.23**	**-0.27**	**-0.44**
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	-0.08	-0.14	***	**-0.28**	**-0.23**	-0.04	-0.07	-0.01	**-0.18**
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	*n.a.*	0.23	0.25	0.26	0.19	0.22	0.16	0.27	0.22
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	**-0.57**
17	549	Dallas, TX	-0.08	0.08	-0.03	-0.10	-0.10	-0.12	**-0.18**	**-0.39**	**-0.24**
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-0.16	-0.11	-0.08	0.00	-0.02
17	671	San Antonio, TX	0.35	0.21	0.05	0.13	-0.18	-0.10	**-0.33**	0.07	**-0.28**
17	674	Temple, TX	-0.09	0.06	-0.03	0.23	0.30	-0.04	0.03	0.05	0.08
17	674A4	Waco, TX	0.26	**-0.22**	***	***	0.27	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*

Table 37a cont. Adjusted Average Work Improvement, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Average Work Improvement	FY98 Average Work Improvement	FY99 Average Work Improvement	FY00 Average Work Improvement	FY01 Average Work Improvement	FY02 Average Work Improvement	FY03 Average Work Improvement	FY04 Average Work Improvement	FY05 Average Work Improvement
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	**-0.33**	0.17	-0.06	-0.03	**-0.26**
18	756	El Paso	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	*n.a.*	***	-0.09	0.18	0.00	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
18	649	Prescott, AZ	0.21	0.11	0.22	-0.03	0.11	0.13	0.00	0.10	0.05
18	678	Tucson, AZ	-0.09	-0.22	-0.02	0.01	-0.16	0.02	-0.11	**-0.24**	-0.12
19	554GE	Col. Springs, CO	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	0.22	0.23	0.25	0.15	**-0.21**	0.04	0.03	0.10	-0.02
19	666	Sheridan, WY	*n.a.*	**-0.37**	**-0.33**	0.32	***	***	-0.11	***	**-0.42**
20	663A4	Am. Lake, WA	0.00	-0.05	0.19	-0.03	-0.14	**-0.35**	**-0.41**	**-0.50**	**-0.71**
20	463	Anchorage, AK	**-0.37**	-0.01	-0.02	0.03	0.02	-0.03	0.18	0.10	0.13
20	648	Portland, OR	-0.03	0.20	0.37	0.35	0.31	0.25	0.24	0.26	0.24
20	653	Roseburg, OR	**-0.30**	-0.23	-0.05	0.10	**-0.27**	***	0.21	***	***
20	663	Seattle, WA	-0.20	**-0.30**	***	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	**-0.55**	**-0.63**	**-0.58**	***
20	692	White City, OR	-0.11	-0.03	-0.03	0.14	0.14	0.19	0.08	0.08	0.03
21	459	Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	0.21	-0.25	0.07	0.13	-0.18	0.01
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	***	**-0.28**	-0.17	-0.07	-0.01	**-0.26**	**-0.14**	0.03	-0.07
21	654	Reno, NV	***	***	***	**-0.30**	**-0.55**	***	**-0.65**	**-0.75**	**-0.53**
21	662	San Francisco, CA	-0.13	**-0.35**	-0.15	**-0.28**	**-0.51**	**-0.32**	**-0.18**	-0.08	-0.04
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	0.37	0.31	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.37	0.29	0.34	0.22
22	600	Long Beach, CA	-0.08	0.26	0.26	0.08	0.25	0.19	0.07	0.14	0.25
22	664	San Diego, CA	*n.a.*	***	-0.18	-0.02	0.07	0.25	0.12	0.09	0.08
22	691A4	Sepulveda, CA	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
22	691	West LA, CA	***	***	-0.13	0.10	***	0.00	-0.09	-0.18	***
23	636A6	Des Moines, IA	*n.a.*	***	0.06	0.19	***	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	**-0.14**
23	437	Fargo, ND						*n.a.*	***	***	0.02
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	-0.02	**-0.39**	0.39	0.44	0.37	0.30	0.19	-0.07	**-0.28**
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	0.46	0.42	0.30	0.36	0.29	0.25	0.28	0.17	0.18
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	-0.08	**-0.41**	0.04	0.30	0.39	0.30	0.40	***	***
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-0.09	**-0.34**	-0.57	-0.03	**-0.29**	0.02
23	636	Omaha, NE	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	**-0.45**
23	438	Sioux Falls, SD	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-0.05	-0.19	***	***	***
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.01	-0.13	-0.03	0.00	0.00	**-0.14**

† Average work improvement has been adjusted for veteran characteristics which vary within each fiscal year.

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

††† Lexington closed but reopened in FY05.

*** Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than ten (10).

Table 37b. Adjusted Improvement in Alcohol Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year†, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY98 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY99 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY00 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY01 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY02 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY03 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY04 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY05 Alcohol Problems Improved %
1	518	Bedford, MA	-32.0%	-32.0%	-26.6%	-32.8%	-34.2%	-46.0%	-41.3%	-34.6%	-56.1%
1	523	Boston, MA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-69.3%	-27.4%	-28.9%	-51.8%	-24.7%	-21.5%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	31.1%	22.6%	-2.9%	0.0%	1.2%	-20.4%	15.9%	31.4%	0.0%
1	608	Manchester, NH	-30.1%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
1	631	Northampton, MA	1.1%	6.1%	4.2%	12.9%	14.0%	14.9%	13.8%	13.0%	-6.2%
1	650	Providence, RI	18.2%	-5.5%	-32.7%	24.8%	24.3%	-30.1%	-34.7%	-50.5%	-45.5%
1	689	West Haven, CT	-29.2%	-20.4%	27.4%	1.8%	8.8%	-47.2%	-35.0%	9.1%	16.5%
1	405	White River Jnct., VT	*n.a.*	***	***	*program closed*	***	***	6.5%	20.4%	38.5%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	-35.6%	-9.3%	-7.3%	-9.1%	-11.4%	-27.6%	-22.9%	-17.0%	-29.9%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	20.7%	65.9%	46.2%	38.7%	33.7%	38.7%	8.2%	41.4%	21.0%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	-17.0%	-21.6%	-54.6%	-19.0%	-13.7%	-35.0%	-11.2%	-8.5%	-24.2%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	40.7%	0.0%	4.7%	22.8%	-16.5%	5.1%	12.4%	19.4%	6.2%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	-19.4%	21.0%	-42.7%	1.2%	-41.0%	-54.0%	-13.0%	-26.7%	16.2%
3	526	Bronx, NY	-43.6%	38.8%	8.9%	15.1%	16.1%	9.0%	0.6%	30.2%	7.9%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	***	-3.4%	6.6%	-4.3%	-26.1%	-45.6%	-9.1%	-33.6%	-46.8%
3	561A	East Orange, NJ	-24.1%	48.0%	*see above*	15.9%	24.7%	23.5%	-21.1%	23.0%	27.0%
3	561B	Lyons, NJ	9.2%	55.5%	*see above*	*see above*	13.6%	33.2%	35.5%	47.2%	33.7%
3	620	Montrose, NY	-23.9%	0.8%	-2.8%	*see above*	-29.5%	-37.2%	-36.0%	-29.1%	-37.6%
3	561	New Jersey HCS	*see below*	*see below*	21.1%	-5.0%	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*
3	632	Northport, NY	-17.1%	29.8%	-1.6%	***	-11.3%	-19.7%	9.6%	-28.0%	-30.4%
4	529	Butler, PA	***	54.9%	52.7%	44.3%	47.1%	42.5%	33.1%	27.3%	19.1%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	27.5%	46.7%	39.8%	42.1%	35.6%	33.2%	35.5%	46.0%	29.2%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	0.0%	15.3%	28.5%	22.8%	30.4%	32.9%	15.8%	44.1%	38.0%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	***	61.3%	57.4%	35.7%	22.3%	43.3%	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
4	656A5	Pittsburgh, PA	-42.0%	9.6%	14.9%	5.3%	13.6%	-12.7%	11.1%	34.2%	19.9%
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	0.0%	8.7%	7.0%	***
5	512	Baltimore, MD	***	25.5%	31.2%	7.5%	-24.5%	9.5%	-9.1%	-11.2%	-23.9%
5	512A4	Fort Howard, MD	*n.a.*	***	16.3%	14.8%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	***	***	1.2%	4.5%	18.3%	29.3%	6.1%	23.7%	9.2%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	34.4%	-6.8%	27.5%	***	40.3%	36.9%	30.7%	41.5%	23.0%
5	688	Washington DC	-39.3%	-5.1%	-1.4%	-25.3%	-5.8%	-40.7%	-6.7%	-12.5%	-1.4%
6	637	Asheville, NC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-15.2%	-35.0%	40.6%	-12.3%	-40.5%
6	558	Durham, NC	55.0%	15.8%	14.2%	***	16.2%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
6	590	Hampton, VA	11.5%	-0.7%	7.5%	3.2%	27.1%	13.9%	24.0%	35.6%	12.0%
6	652	Richmond, VA	-60.9%	-29.0%	-30.5%	*program closed*	***	-106.0%	-66.9%	-44.4%	-74.7%
6	658	Salem, VA	-14.9%	-89.9%	28.0%	30.8%	29.6%	19.3%	21.2%	28.5%	-0.9%
6	659	Salisbury, NC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***
7	508	Atlanta, GA	-5.5%	-22.6%	-34.4%	-0.1%	-15.6%	-1.9%	-20.0%	-17.3%	-18.5%
7	509	Augusta, GA	-8.9%	-33.4%	-12.4%	-10.7%	-23.0%	-14.2%	-22.6%	-2.4%	-4.5%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	50.6%	12.9%	39.3%	0.0%	28.6%	43.8%	***
7	534	Charleston, SC	18.2%	33.5%	20.7%	29.4%	-8.1%	13.4%	17.7%	24.9%	10.9%
7	544	Columbia, SC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-49.4%	-34.0%	-24.2%	-45.6%
7	557	Dublin, GA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	32.1%	***	41.8%	29.3%	23.4%	-1.4%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	-11.2%	11.4%	-5.3%	-6.2%	28.7%	0.5%	15.9%	18.7%	-0.3%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-74.0%	-10.2%	48.0%	54.1%	39.2%

Table 37b cont. Adjusted Improvement in Alcohol Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY98 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY99 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY00 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY01 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY02 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY03 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY04 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY05 Alcohol Problems Improved %
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	3.7%	39.8%	35.8%	-42.1%	-35.4%	-23.4%	-14.6%	-8.1%	16.0%
8	573A	Gainesville, FL	***	57.0%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	573B	Lake City, FL	***	32.8%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	546	Miami, FL	-10.3%	-11.7%	12.6%	30.4%	16.2%	-3.2%	14.3%	25.8%	***
8	573	N.FL/S.GA VHS	*see below*	*see below*	31.7%	11.9%	3.8%	25.6%	4.5%	32.5%	9.2%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL							52.8%	36.4%
8	673	Tampa, FL	-4.4%	14.2%	-2.4%	8.7%	0.4%	-5.9%	27.4%	36.4%	24.7%
8	548	W. Palm Beach, FL	*n.a.*	***	-25.9%	-24.8%	-3.2%	-18.0%	-0.4%	7.3%	-15.1%
9	596	Lexington, KY†††	-18.7%	-23.8%	-68.8%	-32.0%	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	-61.5%
9	603	Louisville, KY	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	11.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	***	11.3%	20.6%	2.1%	5.3%	13.9%	-15.0%	-22.6%	-6.9%
9	621	Mt. Home, TN	-46.6%	-27.3%	-24.6%	-23.1%	35.6%	27.3%	28.7%	29.8%	16.2%
9	622	Murfreesboro, TN	-38.0%	-44.4%	-36.2%	-25.4%	-39.5%	-22.4%	-35.3%	-21.4%	-15.1%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	2.1%	17.1%	-9.9%	-17.6%	0.0%	32.1%	31.1%	42.0%	33.8%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	45.3%	23.1%	5.2%	12.0%	3.1%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	34.3%	16.2%	0.0%	8.2%	12.4%	-6.8%	19.7%	28.6%	18.7%
10	765	Columbus, OH							***	***	***
10	552	Dayton, OH	-10.6%	***	-21.7%	0.0%	-41.3%	-0.9%	4.2%	***	-24.8%
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***	-45.8%	-64.4%	-56.9%	-53.0%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	-12.5%	9.2%	-6.5%	-14.2%	-1.2%	-26.7%	-13.9%	2.6%	-47.6%
11	550	Danville, IL	0.9%	***	-4.0%	-30.1%	-41.3%	-42.4%	-16.1%	-8.2%	7.6%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	*n.a.*	-28.5%	-46.7%	-42.6%	-33.6%	-31.3%	-22.4%	-22.1%	-18.1%
12	578	Hines, IL	9.1%	-32.9%	-11.6%	-29.2%	-21.2%	-31.5%	-19.9%	18.0%	-41.3%
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
12	607	Madison, WI	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	31.6%	-1.0%	-1.4%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	-18.6%	11.7%	42.9%	9.4%	19.3%	5.8%	-14.5%	25.5%	5.8%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	12.4%	***	13.4%	25.6%	27.8%	21.5%	20.3%	33.1%	24.2%
12	676	Tomah, WI	-46.7%	16.4%	5.1%	-49.2%	22.2%	32.6%	8.4%	-8.8%	17.6%
15	589A4	Columbia, MO	***	***	-49.9%	***	***	***	***	-6.3%	***
15	589	Kansas City, KS	-34.6%	9.7%	-2.0%	21.7%	***	***	-8.1%	-5.6%	-22.1%
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	-36.9%	-2.8%	-27.2%	-10.8%	-17.6%	-21.5%	6.7%	33.4%	6.8%
15	647	Poplar Bluff, MO	***	52.7%	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
15	657	St. Louis, MO	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***	***
15	677	Topeka, KS	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	-56.4%	-71.4%	-52.4%	-32.2%	-14.9%
16	520	Biloxi, MI	-50.4%	32.4%	17.8%	0.6%	17.1%	8.7%	-10.2%	-8.4%	-12.8%
16	580	Houston, TX	-27.6%	44.4%	26.7%	40.5%	23.1%	-7.7%	-38.3%	-28.4%	-4.9%
16	586	Jackson, MS	***	16.3%	-16.0%	-39.7%	-56.8%	-85.9%	-53.7%	-8.6%	-32.1%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	-72.8%	-4.0%	-16.8%	-2.8%	1.5%	4.6%	-14.0%	-2.9%	-18.0%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	-12.6%	-2.1%	***	14.7%	-4.5%	24.6%	35.6%	18.1%	17.8%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	***	-3.1%	1.7%	18.7%	27.9%	18.7%	26.6%	37.5%	16.1%
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	-45.3%
17	549	Dallas, TX	-8.4%	14.0%	7.1%	-1.2%	-3.5%	-13.8%	-25.7%	-30.4%	-42.5%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-6.0%	-15.3%	-9.7%	-0.6%	-0.5%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	8.0%	4.4%	-14.6%	-11.9%	-19.6%	-38.1%	-5.3%	-8.6%	-54.9%
17	674	Temple, TX	31.2%	13.8%	-23.8%	-28.5%	11.5%	-11.4%	-13.8%	0.5%	2.2%
17	674A4	Waco, TX	25.6%	-2.5%	***	***	-27.8%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*

Table 37b cont. Adjusted Improvement in Alcohol Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY98 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY99 Alcohol Problems Improved Status Unknown	FY00 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY01 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY02 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY03 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY04 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY05 Alcohol Problems Improved %
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	-29.6%	-2.4%	-37.8%	-2.9%	-43.7%
18	756	El Paso	n.a.	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	n.a.	***	-44.0%	-10.4%	-40.7%	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed
18	649	Prescott, AZ	55.4%	41.7%	40.1%	18.9%	4.0%	24.5%	10.0%	36.9%	26.8%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	5.4%	-26.2%	3.3%	0.8%	-37.5%	-58.1%	-27.6%	-16.9%	-10.6%
19	554GE	Col. Springs, CO	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	-28.5%	***	***
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	36.7%	-3.2%	***	30.2%	-62.2%	14.2%	-45.7%	7.9%	-17.6%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	n.a.	-12.0%	-57.0%	-18.1%	***	***	-90.5%	***	-39.8%
20	663A4	Am. Lake, WA	6.4%	-16.4%	4.4%	-4.3%	-31.2%	-6.0%	-25.5%	-45.0%	-48.6%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	-45.7%	-14.3%	-9.8%	25.7%	4.9%	24.0%	2.1%	4.3%	7.4%
20	648	Portland, OR	3.3%	-2.3%	23.1%	44.7%	29.2%	5.0%	7.0%	23.9%	12.7%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	-38.8%	-42.2%	-19.1%	-26.1%	-64.2%	***	-37.9%	***	***
20	663	Seattle, WA	-39.0%	-32.8%	***	***	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	15.3%	-67.8%	-23.2%	***
20	692	White City, OR	-37.4%	5.9%	-11.1%	10.1%	18.7%	0.2%	18.9%	27.5%	10.8%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	14.5%	-21.9%	3.8%	-8.7%	-35.6%	2.2%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	***	-15.3%	1.6%	-8.0%	-2.9%	-17.6%	-13.1%	11.4%	-22.4%
21	654	Reno, NV	***	***	***	***	-19.5%	***	-83.6%	-123.8%	-71.2%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	-25.1%	-19.9%	-21.2%	-19.9%	-35.0%	-51.5%	-24.9%	-7.8%	-2.1%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	49.8%	46.5%	28.7%	22.3%	20.5%	18.8%	30.1%	37.8%	20.1%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	-39.5%	40.9%	19.1%	-7.1%	18.9%	0.6%	1.2%	24.7%	5.7%
22	664	San Diego, CA	n.a.	***	27.1%	6.0%	47.5%	5.6%	0.4%	0.0%	12.8%
22	691A4	Sepulveda, CA	***	***	***	***	***	9.5%	***	***	***
22	691	West LA, CA	***	***	-22.7%	-9.7%	***	***	4.3%	-20.4%	***
23	636A6	Des Moines, IA	n.a.	***	2.7%	45.1%	***	29.6%	program closed	program closed	program closed
23	437	Fargo, ND						n.a.	***	***	-15.7%
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	3.9%	-47.3%	54.4%	54.8%	48.3%	20.7%	-6.6%	-14.1%	-41.8%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	27.9%	25.1%	2.4%	-3.8%	12.8%	-1.0%	0.0%	32.9%	8.2%
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	-1.4%	-38.1%	9.6%	25.9%	32.9%	-19.7%	47.4%	***	***
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	50.4%	48.0%	***	7.1%	4.4%	13.0%
23	636	Omaha, NE	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.		-73.9%
23	438	Sioux Falls, SD	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-4.2%	11.0%	***	***	***
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	3.8%	6.9%	16.1%	2.2%	-18.2%	-5.5%	7.9%	9.8%	-1.9%

† Improvement in alcohol problems has been adjusted for veteran characteristics which vary within each fiscal year.

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

††† Lexington closed but reopened in FY05.

*** Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than ten (10).

Table 37c. Adjusted Improvement in Drug Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Drug Problems Improved %	FY98 Drug Problems Improved %	FY99 Drug Problems Improved %	FY00 Drug Problems Improved %	FY01 Drug Problems Improved %	FY02 Drug Problems Improved %	FY03 Drug Problems Improved %	FY04 Drug Problems Improved %	FY05 Drug Problems Improved %
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	**-26.4%**	**-28.1%**	**-20.1%**	-29.6%	**-26.0%**	**-46.3%**	**-43.1%**	**-25.0%**	**-38.7%**
1	523	**Boston, MA**	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-64.8%	-3.9%	**-36.6%**	-33.3%	-23.8%	-17.3%
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	40.4%	24.7%	-12.8%	4.2%	-9.8%	-1.3%	11.8%	31.7%	8.1%
1	608	**Manchester, NH**	-20.6%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	2.1%	15.0%	10.6%	14.9%	38.3%	26.5%	21.8%	20.7%	10.2%
1	650	**Providence, RI**	30.9%	0.1%	9.4%	28.7%	34.9%	-35.6%	-23.8%	**-55.9%**	**-38.7%**
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	-18.6%	-20.5%	26.0%	-9.9%	23.5%	**-46.8%**	**-42.5%**	12.5%	29.0%
1	405	**White River Jnct., VT**	*n.a.*	***	***	*program closed*	***	***	-21.8%	15.2%	33.7%
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	-19.9%	2.3%	-12.6%	-11.9%	0.0%	**-31.4%**	**-36.9%**	-18.0%	-17.8%
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	47.3%	62.1%	52.5%	35.8%	36.5%	39.8%	3.5%	41.3%	32.1%
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	**-26.9%**	**-42.4%**	**-61.1%**	-24.8%	-7.9%	**-37.5%**	3.0%	-11.2%	**-28.4%**
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	30.2%	**-31.1%**	-3.6%	7.1%	-21.0%	-13.8%	10.8%	9.1%	9.1%
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	-21.4%	10.3%	**-27.6%**	11.3%	**-43.4%**	**-52.2%**	-11.5%	**-44.1%**	16.9%
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	**-54.2%**	25.5%	-2.7%	-13.9%	5.4%	**-20.9%**	**-29.4%**	5.8%	-19.9%
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	*n.a.*	-6.5%	-1.1%	-8.3%	**-27.0%**	**-51.2%**	-16.5%	**-25.5%**	**-35.9%**
3	561A	**East Orange, NJ**	-22.4%	43.4%	*see above*	*see above*	11.4%	19.0%	-6.4%	38.2%	41.3%
3	561B	**Lyons, NJ**	15.7%	54.1%	*see above*	*see above*	10.2%	39.1%	31.8%	47.0%	43.0%
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	-15.8%	0.1%	-4.5%	-11.5%	**-30.2%**	**-37.3%**	**-38.4%**	**-32.4%**	**-28.8%**
3	561	**New Jersey HCS**	*see below*	*see below*	26.1%	15.0%	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*
3	632	**Northport, NY**	-0.2%	29.7%	12.5%	***	-10.1%	-13.1%	16.4%	-28.8%	-15.0%
4	529	**Butler, PA**	***	49.3%	42.1%	46.2%	17.9%	44.2%	35.8%	29.0%	29.8%
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	35.4%	47.1%	41.3%	37.0%	39.6%	34.3%	37.2%	38.7%	40.2%
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	16.0%	21.2%	20.8%	27.3%	31.5%	3.0%	14.4%	35.3%	46.8%
4	642	**Philadelphia, PA**	***	63.7%	59.8%	36.7%	-0.2%	47.0%	*p rogram closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
4	656A5	**Pittsburgh, PA**	**-34.7%**	5.6%	17.6%	0.0%	22.6%	-3.9%	15.6%	31.6%	24.6%
4	693	**Wilkes Barre, PA**	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	11.0%	3.0%	-24.1%	***
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	***	-4.2%	48.1%	18.7%	-16.5%	8.7%	3.6%	-8.6%	-19.4%
5	512A4	**Fort Howard, MD**	*n.a.*	***	20.6%	-5.4%	***	*p rogram closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	*n.a.*	***	7.5%	6.2%	19.1%	32.2%	4.3%	27.1%	22.3%
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	10.3%	-17.1%	45.9%	***	43.0%	39.8%	32.9%	39.2%	23.4%
5	688	**Washington DC**	**-44.4%**	-9.2%	-20.1%	**-50.5%**	-20.6%	**-33.0%**	-12.1%	-11.4%	0.0%
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	***	***	***	***	-12.5%	-19.5%	38.8%	-19.3%	**-60.3%**
6	558	**Durham, NC**	50.1%	2.4%	19.5%	***	19.8%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	0.0%	**-17.5%**	7.5%	-6.0%	33.2%	18.8%	19.7%	40.9%	22.7%
6	652	**Richmond, VA**	**-64.3%**	-23.1%	-23.1%	*program closed*	***	-24.6%	**-98.6%**	**-36.2%**	**-54.8%**
6	658	**Salem, VA**	-13.5%	**-102.9%**	14.6%	27.1%	26.1%	25.9%	35.9%	47.0%	25.3%
6	659	**Salisbury, NC**	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	-5.4%	**-28.8%**	**-38.0%**	-0.2%	-7.9%	0.0%	-19.0%	**-19.6%**	-5.6%
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	-22.9%	-30.0%	-17.9%	-12.8%	-13.4%	-15.0%	**-37.1%**	-5.4%	-2.6%
7	521	**Birmingham, AL**	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	36.5%	19.6%	33.6%	10.2%	28.6%	37.9%	***
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	40.1%	8.8%	-17.1%	32.1%	**-37.6%**	-3.9%	5.9%	-0.8%	23.4%
7	544	**Columbia, SC**	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	**-32.6%**	**-40.5%**	**-36.0%**	**-35.8%**
7	557	**Dublin, GA**	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	36.3%	***	43.7%	26.8%	49.5%	16.7%
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	-10.9%	8.7%	-11.4%	-2.1%	**-33.5%**	-9.7%	3.5%	21.7%	11.6%
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	**-90.4%**	-19.6%	48.5%	54.4%	44.7%

Table 37c cont. Adjusted Improvement in Drug Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Drug Problems Improved %	FY98 Drug Problems Improved %	FY99 Drug Problems Improved %	FY00 Drug Problems Improved %	FY01 Drug Problems Improved %	FY02 Drug Problems Improved %	FY03 Drug Problems Improved %	FY04 Drug Problems Improved %	FY05 Drug Problems Improved %
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	31.9%	48.1%	39.0%	**-26.0%**	-12.8%	**-36.3%**	-12.8%	-2.9%	12.1%
8	573A	Gainesville, FL	***	49.7%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	573B	Lake City, FL	***	5.9%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	546	Miami, FL	-22.4%	-21.4%	-14.8%	-2.9%	3.5%	7.6%	10.5%	22.2%	***
8	573	N.FL/S.GA VHS	*see below*	*see below*	16.3%	1.0%	5.8%	16.1%	-2.4%	20.9%	1.7%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL								44.7%	46.5%
8	673	Tampa, FL	-3.3%	29.2%	**-39.3%**	10.2%	-7.6%	-7.9%	18.7%	40.4%	37.7%
8	548	W. Palm Beach, FL	*n.a.*	***	-28.3%	***	3.6%	-22.0%	0.0%	8.1%	-8.9%
9	596	Lexington, KY†††	-8.4%	**-26.0%**	**-47.5%**	**-41.5%**	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	**-59.7%**
9	603	Louisville, KY	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	23.2%
9	614	Memphis, TN	***	11.4%	20.3%	10.0%	2.9%	23.5%	-26.8%	-21.3%	15.4%
9	621	Mt. Home, TN	**-24.3%**	**-20.7%**	**-45.4%**	**-55.6%**	39.7%	26.4%	26.9%	33.3%	25.5%
9	622	Murfreesboro, TN	**-32.1%**	**-44.2%**	**-32.1%**	**-23.9%**	**-37.8%**	**-24.2%**	**-48.4%**	-20.2%	-10.7%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	4.1%	16.2%	3.5%	**-27.4%**	7.3%	32.6%	26.1%	40.6%	44.3%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	48.5%	24.3%	-0.3%	12.2%	15.8%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	41.4%	17.5%	6.1%	10.2%	15.3%	0.6%	13.2%	30.6%	30.3%
10	756	Columbus, OH								***	***
10	552	Dayton, OH	-0.5%	***	**-33.2%**	-2.7%	**-31.9%**	0.4%	-37.0%	***	-22.1%
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***	-42.6%	**-94.8%**	**-57.6%**	**-48.8%**
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	**-17.4%**	0.2%	-12.8%	**-24.6%**	-14.3%	**-27.1%**	-26.8%	-3.1%	**-32.4%**
11	550	Danville, IL	10.0%	***	-14.6%	**-34.0%**	**-31.9%**	**-31.1%**	-6.9%	**-38.7%**	-23.3%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	*n.a.*	17.8%	**-37.5%**	**-56.7%**	**-69.6%**	-21.1%	-23.1%	**-32.3%**	-3.5%
12	578	Hines, IL	12.4%	**-33.0%**	-18.2%	**-26.6%**	**-19.8%**	**-19.2%**	**-44.2%**	10.1%	-21.4%
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
12	607	Madison, WI	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	40.7%	-10.2%	29.1%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	-6.7%	8.7%	41.0%	1.7%	6.0%	-21.3%	-10.8%	30.1%	12.1%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	8.9%	***	10.7%	27.6%	28.7%	24.2%	16.1%	29.7%	25.8%
12	676	Tomah, WI	-24.1%	12.2%	12.2%	**-42.2%**	18.1%	7.4%	-20.3%	1.1%	4.5%
15	543	Columbia, MO	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	17.3%	***
15	589	Kansas City, KS	**-32.2%**	9.3%	4.7%	11.8%	***	***	-9.1%	-5.6%	-12.2%
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	**-47.6%**	-33.1%	**-23.2%**	-9.0%	-21.5%	-21.1%	3.0%	33.3%	14.5%
15	647	Poplar Bluff, MO	***	-41.1%	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
15	657	St. Louis, MO	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***	***
15	677	Topeka, KS	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	**-37.2%**	**-67.1%**	**-52.4%**	**-46.9%**	-24.6%
16	520	Biloxi, MI	**-38.0%**	30.3%	14.1%	20.3%	29.4%	5.7%	2.7%	-11.6%	8.3%
16	580	Houston, TX	**-24.3%**	51.8%	31.2%	40.9%	33.8%	-13.9%	**-37.0%**	**-28.4%**	-2.7%
16	586	Jackson, MS	***	**-47.2%**	-32.0%	**-34.5%**	**-73.5%**	**-86.1%**	**-72.7%**	-10.9%	-15.1%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	**-68.2%**	-0.2%	-11.8%	-7.8%	8.1%	11.8%	-16.5%	-8.2%	-14.0%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	34.6%	-10.3%	***	-9.6%	-7.9%	-1.7%	7.0%	18.4%	16.4%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	*n.a.*	43.0%	18.7%	19.9%	25.5%	3.5%	4.9%	16.0%	30.0%
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	**-58.7%**
17	549	Dallas, TX	**-15.5%**	0.0%	-5.5%	-12.3%	-13.4%	**-22.5%**	**-39.6%**	**-41.6%**	**-50.3%**
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	2.4%	-13.8%	-8.7%	0.0%	8.3%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	-19.0%	-38.7%	***	7.8%	-8.4%	-22.5%	-27.5%	-14.6%	**-52.6%**
17	674	Temple, TX	20.3%	-6.0%	1.7%	-8.8%	-9.8%	-2.6%	-13.4%	-6.2%	8.4%
17	674A4	Waco, TX	41.2%	-20.8%	***	***	-10.3%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*

Table 37c cont. Adjusted Improvement in Drug Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Drug Problems Improved %	FY98 Drug Problems Improved %	FY99 Drug Problems Improved %	FY00 Drug Problems Improved %	FY01 Drug Problems Improved %	FY02 Drug Problems Improved %	FY03 Drug Problems Improved %	FY04 Drug Problems Improved %	FY05 Drug Problems Improved %
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	-36.9%	18.3%	**-32.6%**	15.3%	**-73.1%**
18	756	El Paso	n.a.	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	n.a.	***	***	***	**-33.5%**	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed
18	649	Prescott, AZ	38.2%	53.6%	52.9%	31.5%	45.6%	44.8%	25.0%	42.7%	34.1%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	13.3%	-43.5%	0.5%	-3.8%	**-41.2%**	**-52.5%**	**-33.1%**	-9.9%	2.0%
19	554GE	Col. Springs, CO	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	-29.7%	***	***
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	13.8%	61.1%	***	***	-28.4%	-41.4%	-26.1%	24.7%	-32.4%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	n.a.	-14.3%	-29.8%	***	***	***	**-49.4%**	***	***
20	663A4	Am. Lake, WA	26.9%	-12.8%	6.7%	-14.7%	**-36.7%**	**-41.3%**	**-34.1%**	**-37.6%**	**-37.4%**
20	463	Anchorage, AK	-25.7%	-13.1%	-1.7%	19.9%	16.0%	8.6%	23.2%	-16.5%	17.7%
20	648	Portland, OR	-11.3%	26.3%	37.0%	35.5%	39.3%	23.7%	20.2%	46.8%	22.6%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	-21.5%	-25.0%	-17.7%	-18.6%	**-38.9%**	***	-3.8%	***	***
20	663	Seattle, WA	-10.9%	-54.3%	***	***	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-30.7%	**-53.2%**	-45.3%	***
20	692	White City, OR	-21.4%	11.5%	0.0%	13.3%	18.7%	28.0%	17.3%	34.8%	24.8%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	37.1%	22.0%	24.8%	-53.8%	-6.7%	-1.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	***	-26.1%	19.7%	0.5%	-1.4%	-20.3%	**-27.1%**	11.7%	-8.6%
21	654	Reno, NV	***	***	***	***	-37.3%	***	**-66.6%**	**-76.4%**	**-100.4%**
21	662	San Francisco, CA	-20.5%	-16.3%	**-24.9%**	**-29.2%**	**-35.9%**	**-45.3%**	-17.1%	-16.4%	-4.2%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	54.5%	45.7%	30.8%	18.3%	18.3%	23.0%	26.9%	36.4%	25.2%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	-33.0%	28.7%	19.3%	-2.4%	36.0%	-1.0%	-7.1%	26.8%	20.2%
22	664	San Diego, CA	n.a.	***	***	26.8%	61.7%	34.1%	-14.9%	11.5%	15.2%
22	691A4	Sepulveda, CA	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
22	691	West LA, CA	***	***	-26.6%	-4.1%	***	-2.8%	3.4%	-5.4%	***
23	636A6	Des Moines, IA	n.a.	***	-7.6%	37.1%	***	***	program closed	program closed	program closed
23	437	Fargo, ND	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	-30.0%
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	-7.0%	**-32.7%**	33.0%	41.9%	29.3%	13.2%	3.2%	-5.2%	-32.1%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	53.6%	28.4%	***	28.5%	39.0%	35.4%	17.4%	50.4%	37.1%
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	-0.8%	**-36.5%**	-1.7%	21.0%	55.5%	42.9%	45.7%	***	***
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	51.8%	18.9%	-3.1%	-24.6%	18.7%
23	636	Omaha, NE	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.		**-83.0%**
23	438	Sioux Falls, SD	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-39.9%	22.5%	***	***	***
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	2.6%	9.8%	2.4%	-0.8%	-12.0%	**-24.8%**	-0.1%	5.8%	4.0%

† Improvement in drug problems has been adjusted for veteran characteristics and these characteristics vary within each fiscal year.

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

††† Lexington closed but reopened in FY05.

*** Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than ten (10).

Table 37d. Adjusted Improvement in Mental Health Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY98 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY99 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY00 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY01 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY02 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY03 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY04 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY05 Mental Health Problems Improved %
1	518	Bedford, MA	-20.3%	-19.3%	-33.4%	-36.3%	-41.4%	-55.8%	-43.6%	-44.4%	-44.9%
1	523	Boston, MA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-86.8%	-42.4%	-49.3%	-64.8%	-37.8%	-37.3%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	15.1%	14.8%	-17.3%	1.7%	-15.4%	-12.6%	7.7%	4.9%	-0.4%
1	608	Manchester, NH	-23.1%	***	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed
1	631	Northampton, MA	-3.7%	4.3%	-8.5%	-26.8%	2.0%	9.5%	10.8%	23.4%	13.7%
1	650	Providence, RI	-19.4%	-22.8%	-7.4%	24.0%	21.3%	-37.1%	-28.8%	-51.1%	-34.3%
1	689	West Haven, CT	-13.0%	-9.1%	9.0%	-15.3%	-0.5%	-37.2%	-32.1%	-7.8%	-7.6%
1	405	White River Jnct., VT	n.a.	***	***	program closed	***	***	37.9%	32.5%	39.9%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	-48.4%	1.0%	-3.4%	-13.0%	-33.3%	-37.2%	-36.1%	-45.8%	-43.4%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	43.9%	79.0%	55.9%	40.3%	34.6%	46.9%	20.2%	42.7%	41.2%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	-21.7%	-14.2%	-47.6%	-45.9%	-41.7%	-39.8%	-25.3%	-42.8%	-6.4%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	-2.1%	3.8%	14.3%	***	13.4%	7.5%	17.7%	-4.0%	-82.6%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	-11.5%	11.8%	-38.8%	-16.9%	-61.4%	-52.0%	0.0%	-22.3%	0.2%
3	526	Bronx, NY	-42.2%	47.9%	16.9%	-46.1%	22.1%	-37.6%	-9.4%	-27.0%	-28.5%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	n.a.	0.0%	0.0%	-12.8%	-32.8%	-36.6%	-18.3%	-39.4%	-32.0%
3	561A	East Orange, NJ	-19.4%	65.7%	see above	see above	4.7%	10.1%	-11.8%	-47.6%	55.0%
3	561B	Lyons, NJ	20.7%	61.1%	see above	see above	12.4%	41.9%	44.4%	45.9%	43.9%
3	620	Montrose, NY	-9.5%	-0.9%	-18.3%	-11.3%	-52.8%	-48.4%	-42.0%	-54.2%	-49.2%
3	561	New Jersey HCS	see below	see below	-2.7%	-33.6%	see below	see below	see below	see below	see below
3	632	Northport, NY	-9.9%	-1.3%	-21.6%	***	-19.4%	-8.7%	-5.0%	-42.2%	-16.8%
4	529	Butler, PA	***	48.1%	60.5%	34.5%	37.9%	37.4%	26.7%	0.2%	-20.7%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	16.7%	47.9%	36.5%	14.5%	19.2%	19.4%	17.8%	23.2%	27.5%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	2.2%	10.0%	11.4%	-35.1%	8.8%	15.7%	0.7%	28.6%	43.5%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	***	71.5%	62.1%	33.2%	26.5%	51.4%	program closed	program closed	program closed
4	656A5	Pittsburgh, PA	-30.5%	-10.5%	-13.5%	-11.3%	26.6%	16.2%	36.2%	19.7%	22.8%
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	-11.9%	12.6%	-6.5%	***
5	512	Baltimore, MD	***	0.3%	14.8%	-20.3%	26.9%	-6.6%	-15.2%	-21.2%	-17.0%
5	512A4	Fort Howard, MD	n.a.	***	***	***	***	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	n.a.	***	-10.2%	-0.7%	6.0%	34.7%	5.5%	8.9%	13.0%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	-10.3%	-38.2%	33.4%	***	0.8%	18.7%	15.8%	15.1%	29.3%
5	688	Washington DC	-33.7%	-23.7%	-29.0%	-46.8%	-16.0%	-11.9%	-24.5%	-9.7%	17.1%
6	637	Asheville, NC	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	-48.1%	32.3%	40.6%	-26.7%	-18.4%
6	558	Durham, NC	32.2%	32.5%	***	***	49.1%	***	program closed	program closed	program closed
6	590	Hampton, VA	-7.4%	-17.9%	22.3%	-21.0%	0.0%	9.9%	16.5%	7.8%	-11.0%
6	652	Richmond, VA	-60.3%	-57.1%	-5.7%	program closed	***	-111.1%	-48.8%	-88.1%	-59.6%
6	658	Salem, VA	-28.6%	-35.8%	21.0%	17.0%	42.6%	19.2%	50.1%	50.8%	29.3%
6	659	Salisbury, NC	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	***	***
7	508	Atlanta, GA	4.4%	-6.2%	-18.7%	15.7%	-11.4%	9.4%	-8.8%	-8.4%	0.0%
7	509	Augusta, GA	10.8%	-20.2%	-7.1%	-5.2%	-5.4%	-14.4%	-19.5%	-6.5%	10.6%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	n.a.	n.a.	***	40.6%	50.5%	-28.9%	33.1%	48.6%	***
7	534	Charleston, SC	-0.7%	36.0%	7.6%	1.3%	-14.8%	-32.6%	22.2%	30.5%	32.1%
7	544	Columbia, SC	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	-27.7%	-46.0%	-26.7%	-17.3%
7	557	Dublin, GA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	33.8%	29.1%	30.1%	26.5%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	4.9%	7.6%	-7.6%	-10.8%	18.8%	1.2%	14.3%	10.5%	8.6%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-56.6%	-9.1%	52.9%	51.8%	52.1%

Table 37d cont. Adjusted Improvement in Mental Health Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY98 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY99 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY00 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY01 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY02 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY03 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY04 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY05 Mental Health Problems Improved %
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	12.3%	63.5%	49.6%	-27.8%	-41.2%	-28.1%	7.0%	-12.8%	3.7%
8	573A	Gainesville, FL	***	34.0%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	573B	Lake City, FL	***	-9.7%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	546	Miami, FL	14.8%	-0.3%	-2.5%	0.0%	-7.5%	-12.2%	-7.3%	17.6%	***
8	573	N.FL/S.GA VHS	*see below*	*see below*	16.4%	16.4%	-3.7%	12.1%	-22.5%	16.4%	-0.7%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL								45.3%	47.7%
8	673	Tampa, FL	-20.7%	21.1%	-27.1%	-4.2%	-22.2%	-17.3%	5.5%	2.8%	-8.9%
8	548	W. Palm Beach, FL	*n.a.*	***	-31.9%	-31.6%	-21.0%	-20.5%	-13.6%	14.9%	-4.9%
9	596	Lexington, KY†††	-17.7%	-33.0%	-34.8%	-48.6%	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	-33.9%
9	603	Louisville, KY	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-25.7%
9	614	Memphis, TN	***	8.9%	***	-0.2%	-9.7%	20.8%	-19.2%	-5.8%	2.7%
9	621	Mt. Home, TN	-21.6%	-7.4%	-36.4%	-45.7%	26.0%	24.5%	33.0%	28.6%	22.3%
9	622	Murfreesboro, TN	-30.4%	-31.3%	-39.3%	-52.9%	-52.4%	-38.2%	-49.9%	-51.4%	-43.4%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	0.0%	5.7%	-15.2%	-26.7%	-22.6%	27.5%	36.6%	34.5%	47.9%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	45.2%	25.8%	17.2%	16.8%	20.2%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	-10.7%	12.2%	-19.2%	21.9%	31.1%	9.5%	32.8%	25.1%	17.1%
10	756	Columbus, OH								***	***
10	552	Dayton, OH	-40.5%	***	0.3%	***	-19.6%	-11.4%	-13.6%	***	16.5%
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***	-40.7%	-33.3%	-42.5%	-44.5%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	-8.1%	7.7%	-23.7%	-23.6%	-24.5%	-46.8%	-45.4%	-27.8%	-18.6%
11	550	Danville, IL	24.9%	***	11.3%	-12.5%	-19.6%	-21.2%	-12.0%	-18.5%	18.3%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	*n.a.*	31.2%	-44.3%	-42.4%	-21.4%	-14.1%	-30.6%	-7.2%	-12.0%
12	578	Hines, IL	-19.4%	-48.3%	-30.4%	-28.8%	-28.7%	-51.3%	-55.6%	-25.2%	-54.9%
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
12	607	Madison, WI	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	12.1%	-3.4%	-5.3%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	-25.3%	4.8%	28.1%	15.7%	9.7%	13.6%	8.4%	32.8%	6.9%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	11.6%	***	-5.8%	11.3%	7.1%	3.9%	12.5%	16.1%	15.3%
12	676	Tomah, WI	-34.8%	-18.1%	7.9%	-52.4%	12.5%	14.5%	15.3%	-13.8%	2.3%
15	589A4	Columbia, MO	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	-13.7%	***
15	589	Kansas City, KS	-21.5%	21.7%	6.6%	23.8%	***	***	8.0%	-5.5%	-5.7%
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	-39.9%	-12.1%	-7.1%	-12.5%	-18.0%	-11.4%	21.6%	31.7%	8.1%
15	647	Poplar Bluff, MO	***	55.4%	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
15	657	St. Louis, MO	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***	***
15	677	Topeka, KS	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	-45.7%	-54.5%	-61.6%	-19.6%	-31.9%
16	520	Biloxi, MI	-28.6%	33.0%	23.3%	-16.1%	8.7%	4.0%	-8.1%	-23.1%	-3.6%
16	580	Houston, TX	-21.4%	53.1%	34.6%	40.0%	22.9%	-12.0%	-21.8%	-23.7%	6.7%
16	586	Jackson, MS	***	-15.5%	***	-10.0%	-113.5%	-26.5%	-40.0%	-38.2%	-11.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	-57.1%	-2.3%	-23.9%	-33.4%	-25.6%	-34.6%	-37.5%	-41.9%	-30.2%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	-65.4%	12.6%	***	-75.5%	-60.5%	-69.1%	-22.8%	-60.0%	-31.0%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	*n.a.*	34.3%	29.9%	24.3%	27.9%	3.6%	9.2%	25.5%	32.9%
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	-58.3%
17	549	Dallas, TX	-17.1%	6.6%	-10.1%	-12.9%	-14.3%	-22.4%	-40.0%	-51.6%	-37.0%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-0.5%	-5.4%	3.6%	11.1%	16.1%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	-8.3%	-14.2%	7.6%	***	-39.3%	-18.5%	-37.9%	-24.9%	-72.9%
17	674	Temple, TX	8.1%	-1.0%	-5.5%	***	-2.4%	-22.1%	6.2%	6.7%	16.7%
17	674A4	Waco, TX	30.0%	-7.9%	***	***	26.3%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*

Table 37d cont. Adjusted Improvement in Mental Health Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY98 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY99 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY00 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY01 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY02 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY03 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY04 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY05 Mental Health Problems Improved %
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	-86.1%	2.6%	-36.5%	-14.2%	-24.8%
18	756	El Paso	n.a.	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	n.a.	***	-32.0%	-22.8%	-22.3%	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed
18	649	Prescott, AZ	29.9%	19.3%	35.3%	7.6%	16.1%	0.0%	9.0%	0.0%	6.6%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	-22.8%	-36.3%	-10.9%	-3.7%	-64.4%	-28.1%	-32.0%	-28.8%	27.0%
19	554GE	Col. Springs, CO	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	-4.8%	***	***
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	24.8%	44.9%	2.4%	41.5%	-19.3%	10.2%	-2.9%	-4.7%	-3.4%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	n.a.	-8.6%	-48.2%	***	***	***	-23.2%		-27.0%
20	663A4	Am. Lake, WA	13.8%	-24.1%	2.9%	0.0%	-14.0%	-20.7%	-28.6%	-31.5%	-35.0%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	-47.9%	-3.2%	-16.0%	10.0%	22.0%	-0.7%	12.5%	-12.9%	5.9%
20	648	Portland, OR	-29.1%	-79.9%	50.8%	38.7%	38.3%	23.4%	39.5%	47.4%	38.6%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	-0.6%	-54.6%	-28.5%	2.7%	-27.3%	***	11.8%	***	***
20	663	Seattle, WA	-41.1%	-10.3%	***	***	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-28.0%	-16.4%	-29.8%	
20	692	White City, OR	-18.7%	17.3%	-13.0%	1.9%	17.8%	7.9%	6.3%	19.5%	16.2%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	28.2%	-26.6%	0.0%	-28.5%	-43.6%	-8.5%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	***	-26.7%	-25.8%	-26.4%	-1.3%	-25.4%	-27.4%	-18.5%	-6.4%
21	654	Reno, NV	***	***	***	5.3%	-49.4%	***	-58.2%	-73.1%	-25.3%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	-19.0%	-16.8%	-34.5%	-53.0%	-54.8%	-47.4%	-23.1%	-21.1%	11.1%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	37.8%	52.7%	16.3%	21.3%	-1.5%	10.3%	35.5%	20.6%	7.0%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	18.4%	54.9%	32.1%	-5.0%	31.2%	9.0%	15.3%	19.3%	35.0%
22	664	San Diego, CA	n.a.	***	-46.3%	-12.7%	1.1%	4.1%	-10.0%	-14.2%	19.2%
22	691A4	Sepulveda, CA	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
22	691	West LA, CA	***	***	-22.8%	-20.0%	***	-9.1%	11.1%	1.1%	***
23	636A6	Des Moines, IA	n.a.	***	7.6%	16.5%	***	***	program closed	program closed	program closed
23	437	Fargo, ND	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	-15.1%
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	-1.6%	-41.1%	53.0%	50.6%	54.0%	29.0%	26.5%	13.6%	-29.3%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	35.8%	60.2%	0.6%	26.2%	20.7%	12.2%	44.4%	38.1%	42.4%
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	5.2%	-19.8%	6.6%	36.7%	55.9%	38.5%	52.0%	***	***
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	44.4%	14.1%	26.6%	10.9%	-7.2%	19.9%
23	636	Omaha, NE	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.		-70.4%
23	438	Sioux Falls, SD	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-59.8%	11.8%	***	***	***
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	6.9%	23.8%	-0.5%	-13.4%	-20.5%	-19.9%	-2.7%	-26.4%	-19.0%

† Improvement in mental health problems has been adjusted for veteran characteristics and these characteristics vary within each fiscal year.

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

††† Lexington closed but reopened in FY05.

*** Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than ten (10).

Table 37e. Adjusted Improvement in Medical Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Medical Problems Improved %	FY98 Medical Problems Improved %	FY99 Medical Problems Improved %	FY00 Medical Problems Improved %	FY01 Medical Problems Improved %	FY02 Medical Problems Improved %	FY03 Medical Problems Improved %	FY04 Medical Problems Improved %	FY05 Medical Problems Improved %
1	518	Bedford, MA	-8.8%	-1.7%	-7.9%	**-11.5%**	**-17.6%**	**-22.2%**	**-19.1%**	**-16.7%**	-21.0%
1	523	Boston, MA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-20.7%	-0.8%	14.7%	-16.9%	18.6%	0.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	26.2%	24.2%	-5.8%	12.0%	3.8%	16.0%	11.4%	-4.3%	-5.8%
1	608	Manchester, NH	**-33.8%**	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
1	631	Northampton, MA	1.6%	18.9%	0.0%	-11.5%	0.0%	14.1%	16.6%	40.5%	30.8%
1	650	Providence, RI	2.2%	13.2%	0.0%	20.3%	50.1%	**-21.4%**	-12.0%	**-32.5%**	**-26.2%**
1	689	West Haven, CT	-18.6%	-3.9%	20.3%	0.9%	14.9%	**-35.2%**	**-26.3%**	-8.7%	-3.5%
1	405	White River Jnct., VT	*n.a.*	***	***	*program closed*	***	***	59.7%	13.4%	19.9%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	**-26.9%**	1.6%	-11.1%	-12.1%	-14.3%	-9.7%	**-19.7%**	**-25.6%**	**-32.7%**
2	528A6	Bath, NY	26.4%	-104.6%	76.2%	63.2%	58.0%	71.9%	39.6%	63.4%	62.9%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	-19.3%	-12.2%	**-27.1%**	**-35.7%**	-16.2%	**-30.3%**	**-27.9%**	**-35.6%**	**-28.5%**
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	17.7%	13.4%	15.3%	***	40.1%	-4.8%	16.0%	-3.4%	-9.9%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	**-27.8%**	19.6%	-9.0%	0.2%	**-53.2%**	**-34.6%**	-3.4%	-11.1%	-2.7%
3	526	Bronx, NY	-7.9%	96.7%	***	**-54.8%**	**-40.1%**	**-33.1%**	**-56.3%**	**-38.4%**	**-61.9%**
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	*n.a.*	-4.2%	-1.9%	15.9%	-18.2%	-10.4%	2.8%	-18.6%	-14.7%
3	561A	East Orange, NJ	1.9%	75.3%	*see above*	*see above*	-10.0%	9.2%	12.9%	29.4%	-10.8%
3	561B	Lyons, NJ	-9.5%	80.6%	*see above*	*see above*	59.3%	70.0%	66.7%	66.9%	56.9%
3	620	Montrose, NY	-12.1%	4.3%	-12.0%	1.6%	-16.6%	**-20.5%**	**-34.0%**	**-19.1%**	**-31.5%**
3	561	New Jersey HCS	*see below*	*see below*	10.9%	-1.1%	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*
3	632	Northport, NY	-23.2%	26.7%	5.8%	***	5.2%	15.0%	9.5%	-4.1%	-10.1%
4	529	Butler, PA	***	29.3%	***	21.5%	-1.5%	-6.5%	8.4%	-2.7%	-17.1%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	-5.2%	42.5%	50.5%	9.7%	26.8%	25.9%	34.5%	43.1%	41.4%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	**-30.3%**	3.3%	-13.5%	-24.6%	-18.6%	9.3%	-6.1%	**-27.5%**	32.1%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	***	87.6%	79.5%	65.9%	80.0%	80.9%	*program closed*		***
4	656A5	Pittsburgh, PA	**-28.4%**	-8.8%	**-27.3%**	**-22.9%**	31.7%	19.8%	-5.2%	**-24.5%**	-22.9%
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-7.2%	27.3%	10.5%	***
5	512	Baltimore, MD	***	-2.5%	18.0%	***	**-46.7%**	-21.3%	-8.4%	**-31.9%**	-17.5%
5	512A4	Fort Howard, MD	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	*n.a.*	***	-5.7%	27.7%	17.1%	48.0%	36.9%	18.7%	37.8%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	18.6%	-10.4%	-14.9%	***	-18.5%	-0.5%	**-25.6%**	**-17.3%**	-21.4%
5	688	Washington DC	**-23.0%**	1.0%	-21.4%	**-32.1%**	17.8%	16.7%	19.0%	-4.1%	19.3%
6	637	Asheville, NC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-33.2%	43.2%	60.2%	-19.9%	-4.8%
6	558	Durham, NC	-5.3%	15.2%	16.5%	***	65.2%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
6	590	Hampton, VA	-3.7%	-4.2%	-6.9%	**-21.2%**	**-21.7%**	**-22.1%**	-15.4%	**-31.4%**	-18.8%
6	652	Richmond, VA	**-26.1%**	-18.7%	-11.9%	*program closed*	***	**-67.0%**	**-37.6%**	55.9%	**-65.4%**
6	658	Salem, VA	-24.9%	-16.6%	42.2%	69.5%	75.3%	54.4%	32.8%	45.9%	8.9%
6	659	Salisbury, NC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***
7	508	Atlanta, GA	4.2%	0.0%	11.8%	10.9%	-7.3%	9.9%	20.1%	-9.6%	4.9%
7	509	Augusta, GA	-7.0%	-11.3%	4.1%	-24.9%	9.9%	**-35.4%**	**-27.0%**	**-25.8%**	**-29.3%**
7	521	Birmingham, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	70.2%	60.9%	72.6%	42.4%	65.6%	48.7%	***
7	534	Charleston, SC	-5.9%	18.3%	2.0%	6.5%	-1.3%	-11.5%	37.5%	64.0%	67.6%
7	544	Columbia, SC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	1.6%	11.4%	-7.2%	-11.0%
7	557	Dublin, GA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	73.6%	66.9%	55.5%	40.8%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	9.6%	28.9%	-9.4%	18.1%	0.2%	-9.6%	-0.5%	**-21.0%**	18.3%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-46.4%	8.3%	75.8%	73.5%	73.5%

Table 37e cont. Adjusted Improvement in Medical Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Medical Problems Improved %	FY98 Medical Problems Improved %	FY99 Medical Problems Improved %	FY00 Medical Problems Improved %	FY01 Medical Problems Improved %	FY02 Medical Problems Improved %	FY03 Medical Problems Improved %	FY04 Medical Problems Improved %	FY05 Medical Problems Improved %
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	-19.5%	74.0%	67.4%	-21.0%	0.7%	2.6%	18.5%	5.4%	16.6%
8	573A	Gainesville, FL	***	11.7%	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above
8	573B	Lake City, FL	***	-4.6%	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above
8	546	Miami, FL	-15.8%	6.7%	12.5%	-0.5%	-28.7%	-20.7%	-29.4%	-23.4%	***
8	573	N.FL/S.GA VHS	see below	see below	-2.1%	12.0%	9.2%	-2.0%	-26.9%	-19.3%	-24.7%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL								39.6%	-59.0%
8	673	Tampa, FL	-0.6%	26.4%	2.7%	-11.1%	6.7%	-12.1%	-15.0%	-25.4%	-12.7%
8	548	W. Palm Beach, FL	n.a.	***	***	-46.6%	-47.6%	-30.8%	-35.4%	-22.8%	-6.4%
9	596	Lexington, KY†††	-16.1%	-16.7%	-33.7%	-24.5%	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	-35.0%
9	603	Louisville, KY	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-37.3%
9	614	Memphis, TN	***	30.0%	30.1%	26.5%	-2.3%	31.3%	-9.1%	8.6%	48.7%
9	621	Mt. Home, TN	-9.2%	1.4%	-21.4%	-33.3%	32.2%	66.6%	53.9%	51.6%	49.0%
9	622	Murfreesboro, TN	-11.6%	-11.7%	-19.4%	-29.0%	-31.1%	-21.2%	-34.4%	-38.4%	-35.7%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	4.9%	3.2%	-16.3%	-15.2%	-7.9%	33.9%	3.2%	20.0%	21.5%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	70.3%	55.7%	37.9%	44.6%	35.0%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	6.7%	3.3%	-18.8%	***	21.3%	14.5%	-1.6%	19.8%	20.1%
10	756	Columbus, OH								***	***
10	552	Dayton, OH	3.9%	***	-5.1%	***	-29.5%	15.7%	15.5%	***	24.9%
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	n.a.	***	***	***	***	-22.9%	-27.3%	-28.7%	-26.4%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	5.2%	13.5%	-0.7%	-12.2%	-3.7%	-13.2%	-22.8%	-5.8%	-1.9%
11	550	Danville, IL	-11.0%	***	20.8%	-1.2%	-29.5%	14.5%	33.6%	-36.2%	17.7%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	n.a.	13.3%	-22.9%	-19.2%	-50.5%	-22.3%	-21.8%	-23.1%	-11.1%
12	578	Hines, IL	6.0%	-25.6%	-18.8%	-23.2%	-15.3%	-39.0%	-30.9%	-37.5%	-8.7%
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	program closed	program closed	program closed
12	607	Madison, WI	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	-24.0%	-18.3%	-44.8%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	-19.3%	30.1%	26.8%	21.2%	23.2%	7.4%	-3.9%	34.3%	5.1%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	15.0%	***	30.9%	18.2%	7.0%	3.4%	-15.5%	24.7%	50.6%
12	676	Tomah, WI	0.0%	30.7%	38.4%	-19.9%	46.8%	42.1%	35.0%	0.0%	44.4%
15	589A4	Columbia, MO	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	-2.0%	***
15	589	Kansas City, KS	-8.3%	59.2%	33.1%	42.6%	***	***	18.1%	15.7%	25.0%
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	2.1%	17.2%	30.4%	24.0%	12.9%	29.1%	47.0%	38.3%	40.8%
15	647	Poplar Bluff, MO	***	68.3%	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
15	657	St. Louis, MO	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	***	***	***
15	677	Topeka, KS	see below	see below	see below	see below	3.1%	-39.0%	-21.0%	-42.3%	-47.1%
16	520	Biloxi, MI	-16.6%	4.5%	27.1%	11.3%	20.8%	8.3%	0.5%	-23.5%	16.5%
16	580	Houston, TX	-22.3%	50.4%	33.7%	36.6%	46.5%	-8.7%	-16.6%	-33.5%	7.1%
16	586	Jackson, MS	***	27.7%	-18.8%	-5.9%	-31.8%	-10.1%	-30.5%	-16.5%	-15.9%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	-15.2%	6.3%	-13.5%	-12.9%	-12.1%	-11.8%	-23.8%	-18.9%	-36.2%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	47.9%	-28.0%	***	-64.6%	-39.0%	-25.0%	-12.8%	-25.3%	-32.1%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	n.a.	45.8%	41.9%	57.8%	46.4%	41.5%	62.7%	38.2%	52.5%
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX								see Dallas	-29.6%
17	549	Dallas, TX	-0.1%	10.6%	-5.6%	-4.5%	4.3%	0.0%	-15.4%	-22.7%	-13.1%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	21.9%	24.3%	27.5%	32.7%	34.3%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	-13.9%	33.7%	29.0%	-8.4%	-91.5%	-11.3%	-26.1%	-6.2%	-27.4%
17	674	Temple, TX	15.6%	2.5%	***	***	-2.8%	7.3%	25.4%	24.5%	32.3%
17	674A4	Waco, TX	12.5%	3.8%	***	***	7.6%	***	program closed	program closed	program closed

Table 37e cont. Adjusted Improvement in Medical Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Medical Problems Improved %	FY98 Medical Problems Improved %	FY99 Medical Problems Improved %	FY00 Medical Problems Improved %	FY01 Medical Problems Improved %	FY02 Medical Problems Improved %	FY03 Medical Problems Improved %	FY04 Medical Problems Improved %	FY05 Medical Problems Improved %
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-22.3%	20.8%	3.8%	-2.8%	-11.1%
18	756	El Paso	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	*n.a.*	***	***	***	-2.9%	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
18	649	Prescott, AZ	29.7%	60.6%	51.5%	62.6%	47.0%	28.3%	43.8%	33.9%	25.4%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	**-25.7%**	-11.0%	-17.1%	17.5%	-11.6%	15.8%	-19.0%	-20.8%	**-30.0%**
19	554GE	Col. Springs, CO	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-0.5%	***	***
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	18.8%	-4.4%	**-35.4%**	-6.6%	-13.4%	-5.4%	-14.4%	-4.4%	-21.0%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	*n.a.*	-2.6%	-21.2%	***	***	***	-13.7%	***	-12.8%
20	663A4	Am. Lake, WA	-2.7%	1.6%	27.4%	25.1%	14.7%	-12.2%	-2.8%	-18.0%	-22.1%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	-13.2%	19.0%	9.1%	18.2%	34.5%	31.9%	29.8%	32.3%	39.8%
20	648	Portland, OR	-26.6%	21.9%	54.4%	68.8%	60.1%	60.8%	65.5%	69.3%	59.0%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	-18.1%	-36.6%	-2.7%	10.1%	-16.9%	***	-42.5%	***	***
20	663	Seattle, WA	-9.1%	-12.2%	***	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	19.5%	-35.1%	-25.6%	***
20	692	White City, OR	-5.0%	16.3%	17.4%	32.5%	29.7%	61.1%	49.2%	24.1%	29.7%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	***	-32.2%	13.9%	**-51.0%**	2.3%	26.7%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	***	4.5%	-17.3%	-14.2%	10.4%	0.8%	-3.0%	4.9%	0.0%
21	654	Reno, NV	***	***	***	***	6.2%	***	**-34.5%**	36.0%	-15.4%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	-10.3%	**-20.8%**	-16.0%	**-23.1%**	**-42.4%**	**-27.3%**	-5.8%	**-22.3%**	46.0%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	12.1%	39.5%	15.0%	27.7%	27.0%	45.1%	24.1%	27.8%	17.3%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	-4.7%	34.6%	36.8%	20.6%	45.6%	36.1%	33.0%	48.3%	53.9%
22	664	San Diego, CA	*n.a.*	***	-22.7%	2.1%	15.6%	20.2%	-2.7%	13.5%	25.6%
22	691A4	Sepulveda, CA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***	***
22	691	West LA, CA	***	***	6.9%	11.6%	***	29.1%	29.6%	-28.6%	***
23	636A6	Des Moines, IA	*n.a.*	***	2.3%	39.9%	***	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
23	437	Fargo, ND	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	-12.8%
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	12.3%	-1.1%	43.7%	71.3%	81.2%	48.5%	57.7%	57.4%	4.7%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	26.6%	37.9%	***	69.2%	32.4%	57.3%	59.8%	57.6%	62.9%
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	11.9%	-12.8%	16.1%	45.5%	77.0%	62.1%	57.9%	***	***
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-11.2%	-20.0%	27.8%	-3.3%	**-24.9%**	**-28.9%**
23	636	Omaha, NE	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*		-27.0%
23	438	Sioux Falls, SD	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-21.0%	-15.2%	***	***	***
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	9.2%	31.3%	1.2%	0.0%	-4.9%	-4.5%	0.0%	**-23.4%**	-21.8%

† Improvement in medical problems has been adjusted for veteran characteristics which vary within each fiscal year.

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

††† Lexington closed but reopened in FY05.

*** Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than ten (10).

Table 37f. Adjusted Competitively Employed at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY98 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY99 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY00 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY01 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY02 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY03 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY04 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY05 Competitively Employed at Discharge %
1	518	Bedford, MA	-31.9%	-25.8%	-14.0%	-9.6%	-12.5%	-15.3%	-17.0%	-14.5%	-11.0%
1	523	Boston, MA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-7.3%	22.2%	9.1%	5.4%	1.6%	-2.2%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	1.3%	-8.8%	-9.7%	-11.7%	-24.5%	-14.0%	2.1%	-14.3%	-13.7%
1	608	Manchester, NH	-8.3%	***	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed
1	631	Northampton, MA	-0.2%	-15.2%	-4.3%	6.4%	15.1%	6.0%	4.2%	1.5%	-4.4%
1	650	Providence, RI	-18.4%	-22.0%	-18.6%	-14.3%	-24.0%	-20.6%	-2.7%	-11.7%	-1.7%
1	689	West Haven, CT	0.0%	-7.7%	25.8%	1.7%	6.7%	3.0%	6.3%	1.7%	-2.4%
1	405	White River Jnct., VT	n.a.	***	***	program closed	***	***	23.2%	2.1%	20.5%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	-16.7%	-8.9%	-2.2%	2.6%	13.4%	4.0%	10.1%	4.3%	15.4%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	4.8%	-43.5%	-1.4%	11.8%	20.2%	24.0%	-1.4%	-41.0%	-29.5%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	-9.8%	-12.1%	-10.5%	-11.1%	-2.1%	-6.3%	4.7%	1.2%	5.6%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	-4.8%	-21.4%	-18.2%	2.5%	9.0%	16.2%	19.6%	-5.9%	-6.1%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	-16.4%	-10.5%	-1.5%	8.0%	-4.4%	-14.0%	6.3%	5.3%	7.6%
3	526	Bronx, NY	-23.8%	10.0%	-7.6%	-3.7%	0.6%	-1.1%	-0.3%	6.5%	3.3%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	n.a.	4.7%	23.3%	2.9%	-5.6%	-2.4%	-11.5%	-9.8%	-1.8%
3	561A	East Orange, NJ	-4.1%	20.1%	see above	see above	15.2%	19.4%	-10.3%	-12.8%	25.8%
3	561B	Lyons, NJ	9.8%	20.1%	see above	see above	12.6%	-2.6%	-0.4%	16.4%	-17.2%
3	620	Montrose, NY	5.6%	-13.1%	-12.4%	-5.1%	-10.9%	-6.3%	-10.5%	0.0%	-0.9%
3	561	New Jersey HCS	see below	see below	14.9%	11.8%	see below	see below	see below	see below	see below
3	632	Northport, NY	-12.8%	-3.9%	9.6%	***	-17.1%	-2.6%	1.8%	-15.5%	-10.1%
4	529	Butler, PA	***	-3.6%	-10.9%	-1.8%	-4.7%	-1.4%	0.7%	-27.8%	17.3%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	-5.4%	21.6%	2.2%	-9.3%	10.4%	2.6%	-0.2%	0.3%	-4.7%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	1.6%	-2.3%	0.5%	4.7%	9.3%	2.6%	-8.6%	-2.5%	5.0%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	***	-6.6%	31.2%	-19.2%	-1.6%	49.5%	program closed	program closed	program closed
4	656A5	Pittsburgh, PA	-0.9%	-10.0%	1.7%	-12.8%	-4.7%	-0.4%	-3.9%	1.5%	-1.3%
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	24.2%	6.6%	21.4%	***
5	512	Baltimore, MD	***	-6.0%	-9.0%	10.3%	-34.9%	0.6%	-4.1%	-11.0%	1.7%
5	512A4	Fort Howard, MD	n.a.	***	21.9%	14.3%	***	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	n.a.	***	21.2%	6.4%	-6.0%	0.0%	-14.8%	-11.5%	-5.5%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	23.9%	-6.3%	-12.0%	***	-16.9%	-19.3%	-25.8%	-8.9%	-8.1%
5	688	Washington DC	20.3%	-15.2%	8.6%	1.3%	7.4%	6.6%	7.0%	0.2%	5.9%
6	637	Asheville, NC	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	11.6%	24.1%	20.3%	-3.9%	14.4%
6	558	Durham, NC	29.9%	9.3%	5.2%	-4.0%	-7.7%	***	program closed	program closed	program closed
6	590	Hampton, VA	20.0%	-10.3%	3.3%	7.1%	15.0%	1.2%	20.0%	15.2%	12.7%
6	652	Richmond, VA	-24.9%	3.4%	-18.5%	program closed	***	-24.9%	-15.2%	3.9%	-19.1%
6	658	Salem, VA	-20.9%	-6.0%	-2.8%	-11.5%	-11.2%	-17.8%	-7.9%	2.9%	-8.8%
6	659	Salisbury, NC	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	***	***
7	508	Atlanta, GA	-1.7%	-9.7%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	6.8%	10.5%	1.4%	8.6%
7	509	Augusta, GA	-23.9%	-24.2%	3.0%	-7.8%	-11.5%	-15.7%	-14.4%	-4.2%	1.6%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	n.a.	n.a.	21.4%	16.0%	21.1%	-16.1%	17.1%	16.1%	***
7	534	Charleston, SC	-5.6%	11.1%	2.4%	17.1%	-11.3%	9.5%	22.8%	6.2%	23.1%
7	544	Columbia, SC	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	4.9%	-3.1%	-13.1%	0.0%
7	557	Dublin, GA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	9.6%	***	2.2%	-18.3%	-8.1%	-4.3%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	0.0%	-10.5%	-5.7%	-10.8%	-1.9%	4.3%	6.8%	10.9%	13.5%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-35.3%	-6.6%	12.5%	13.1%	11.7%

Table 37f cont. Adjusted Competitively Employed at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY98 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY99 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY00 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY01 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY02 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY03 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY04 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY05 Competitively Employed at Discharge %
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	-1.0%	-7.9%	-4.8%	-9.6%	-7.6%	-7.5%	1.2%	10.3%	21.7%
8	573A	Gainesville, FL	***	13.8%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	573B	Lake City, FL	***	9.4%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	546	Miami, FL	14.9%	-18.7%	-11.8%	11.0%	17.9%	8.4%	3.1%	14.7%	***
8	573	N.FL/S.GA VHS	*see below*	*see below*	10.3%	10.2%	10.7%	9.8%	13.8%	21.3%	13.7%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL								29.2%	44.5%
8	673	Tampa, FL	-4.8%	10.0%	4.8%	11.5%	28.4%	30.1%	14.2%	15.7%	5.5%
8	548	W. Palm Beach, FL	*n.a.*	***	-3.9%	15.1%	17.9%	11.5%	13.2%	18.3%	16.9%
9	596	Lexington, KY†††	-13.3%	-22.8%	-6.5%	-18.4%	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*	-8.6%
9	603	Louisville, KY	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-4.6%
9	614	Memphis, TN	***	-12.8%	0.2%	-11.6%	2.4%	15.8%	-28.6%	-19.4%	-6.7%
9	621	Mt. Home, TN	-5.0%	-25.1%	-11.0%	-11.3%	-8.0%	-4.0%	-12.3%	-3.6%	-5.1%
9	622	Murfreesboro, TN	-6.6%	-11.5%	-5.2%	-12.5%	-9.3%	-9.6%	-18.4%	-7.0%	4.7%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	-5.9%	9.4%	-2.2%	7.7%	7.9%	23.5%	13.2%	8.9%	21.2%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	40.8%	29.0%	0.0%	-8.7%	-1.8%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	-0.4%	-2.3%	10.3%	-2.6%	-3.4%	-13.6%	-25.2%	-17.3%	-3.1%
10	756	Columbus, OH								***	***
10	552	Dayton, OH	6.9%	***	10.3%	-6.9%	-9.0%	-16.5%	-9.1%	***	-13.7%
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***	-11.2%	-15.0%	-5.8%	-15.4%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	-7.3%	-4.6%	-0.2%	-4.8%	-4.9%	-16.1%	-7.2%	-13.7%	-9.6%
11	550	Danville, IL	-26.9%	***	8.3%	-18.4%	-9.0%	-25.2%	12.2%	-4.5%	22.6%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	*n.a.*	14.6%	-17.0%	-5.4%	-3.6%	6.2%	-0.7%	2.2%	0.6%
12	578	Hines, IL	2.8%	-28.3%	4.0%	5.0%	0.2%	-11.1%	-8.8%	8.1%	-16.2%
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
12	607	Madison, WI	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	3.9%	-2.5%	-3.5%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	12.0%	-17.7%	-6.3%	-3.4%	-5.0%	-14.5%	-20.9%	-17.4%	-0.8%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	-16.4%	***	13.6%	22.4%	14.6%	21.7%	5.8%	13.8%	32.3%
12	676	Tomah, WI	-10.0%	-23.8%	1.6%	-23.1%	-7.6%	-6.0%	9.2%	-1.8%	-8.9%
15	589A4	Columbia, MO	***	***	-7.9%	***	***	***	***	6.6%	***
15	589	Kansas City, KS	-19.1%	-9.8%	-7.2%	-7.3%	***	***	-7.0%	2.2%	11.2%
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	-22.2%	-6.3%	-6.8%	-12.9%	5.0%	7.5%	0.5%	-0.3%	-20.1%
15	647	Poplar Bluff, MO	***	0.0%	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
15	657	St. Louis, MO	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***	***
15	677	Topeka, KS	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	-16.9%	-16.0%	4.6	-14.0%	0.6%
16	520	Biloxi, MI	-20.2%	-9.2%	7.6%	-4.7%	4.5%	1.7%	-3.1%	-11.0%	-0.3%
16	580	Houston, TX	5.6%	16.2%	3.5%	11.1%	8.0%	-4.1%	-8.3%	-5.5%	1.9%
16	586	Jackson, MS	***	-20.4%	-11.3%	-8.4%	-4.8%	-37.2%	10.9%	-9.3%	4.2%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	-19.5%	-5.0%	2.1%	0.0%	6.0%	0.2%	2.2%	8.3%	15.3%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	-18.1%	-27.2%	***	-30.8%	-13.3%	-12.1%	-0.1%	-13.1%	-24.2%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	*n.a.*	-1.1%	2.1%	-9.0%	7.1%	0.9%	-15.0%	-9.0%	0.6%
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	*see Dallas*	-28.6%
17	549	Dallas, TX	-21.1%	-21.7%	-25.5%	-17.1%	-19.4%	-27.6%	-25.1%	-27.8%	-15.5%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-10.7%	-9.8%	-12.5%	-14.6%	6.6%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	-1.9%	-17.0%	14.3%	-3.8%	-14.7%	-8.9%	-6.6%	6.2%	-6.2%
17	674	Temple, TX	-9.1%	-30.2%	-24.8%	-20.0%	27.4%	5.6%	-9.0%	-0.2%	9.7%
17	674A4	Waco, TX	4.3%	-18.8%	***	***	-13.7%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*

Table 37f cont. Adjusted Competitively Employed at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY98 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY99 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY00 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY01 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY02 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY03 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY04 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY05 Competitively Employed at Discharge %
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	-4.7%	-12.6%	-9.2%	-2.3%	-3.0%
18	756	El Paso	n.a.	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	n.a.	***	5.2%	21.7%	14.7%	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed
18	649	Prescott, AZ	-8.6%	-12.9%	5.9%	-2.0%	-1.1%	-4.6%	8.1%	-1.4%	0.5%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	-8.5%	**-29.7%**	-0.6%	9.6%	-7.5%	-5.4%	**-19.1%**	**-15.4%**	-3.8%
19	554GE	Col. Springs, CO	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	4.8%	***	***
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	14.1%	18.4%	13.9%	30.2%	7.7%	-2.5%	14.8%	25.4%	15.0%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	n.a.	-12.0%	-26.8%	5.8%	***	***	-17.2%	***	-22.2%
20	663A4	Am. Lake, WA	0.9%	-9.3%	8.3%	11.7%	-7.3%	7.3%	-19.8%	-4.3%	7.1%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	-13.8%	-10.2%	-13.5%	20.2%	-4.3%	-7.7%	0.3%	-7.4%	17.6%
20	648	Portland, OR	-10.5%	**-25.7%**	-0.5%	2.7%	-6.6%	-11.3%	-7.3%	4.1%	17.1%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	-3.2%	**-34.5%**	-5.4%	-10.7%	**-29.4%**	***	-11.3%	***	***
20	663	Seattle, WA	17.8%	**-36.0%**	***	***	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	14.7%	-2.8%	3.1%	***
20	692	White City, OR	11.1%	0.7%	5.5%	1.5%	5.2%	9.6%	14.3%	6.7%	8.2%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	18.6%	1.9%	17.6%	1.2%	-13.7%	22.4%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	***	**-17.7%**	3.6%	2.7%	15.0%	-1.0%	-3.1%	12.3%	7.7%
21	654	Reno, NV	***	***	***	-15.0%	-9.6%	***	**-33.0%**	**-32.4%**	11.1%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	6.1%	-1.7%	-1.6%	-3.7%	**-19.4%**	**-16.6%**	-9.5%	2.6%	-4.8%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	24.1%	8.5%	-4.7%	**-13.2%**	6.9%	12.4%	5.5%	10.7%	8.6%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	-7.9%	5.2%	22.5%	0.6%	28.8%	-0.8%	7.4%	20.8%	21.6%
22	664	San Diego, CA	n.a.	***	-6.3%	16.4%	16.0%	2.4%	-11.2%	**-20.2%**	17.8%
22	691A4	Sepulveda, CA	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
22	691	West LA, CA	***	***	**-25.5%**	16.4%	***	6.2%	-0.2%	20.1%	***
23	636A6	Des Moines, IA	n.a.	***	5.7%	13.5%	***	***	program closed	program closed	program closed
23	437	Fargo, ND	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	11.3%
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	-12.7%	**-30.7%**	4.7%	12.4%	6.9%	-9.7%	-1.4%	-7.6%	-9.4%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	-4.4%	-12.1%	-11.0%	-7.6%	1.7%	-7.2%	4.5%	12.8%	3.9%
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	**-18.7%**	0.9%	5.3%	6.6%	21.5%	5.6%	3.3%	***	***
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	21.6%	20.2%	6.8%	17.5%	-10.0%	10.9%
23	636	Omaha, NE	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.		6.0%
23	438	Sioux Falls, SD	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-9.4%	-6.3%	***	***	***
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	-1.8%	-5.2%	6.5%	-5.6%	-9.4%	-8.3%	-8.1%	**-10.5%**	-3.5%

† Improvement in competitive employment situation has been adjusted for veteran characteristics and these characteristics vary within each fiscal year.

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

††† Lexington closed but reopened in FY05.

*** Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than ten (10).

Table 37g. Adjusted Unemployed at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY98 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY99 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY00 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY01 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY02 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY03 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY04 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY05 Unemployed at Discharge %
1	518	Bedford, MA	-8.9%	0.6%	6.9%	16.3%	9.3%	15.8%	23.0%	23.2%	20.1%
1	523	Boston, MA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	23.8%	-5.3%	-0.9%	8.2%	17.3%	-1.4%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	7.6%	-10.4%	-2.8%	2.9%	4.5%	13.3%	-0.2%	21.7%	33.6%
1	608	Manchester, NH	11.1%	***	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed
1	631	Northampton, MA	2.8%	9.2%	-1.8%	-2.0%	-5.7%	0.0%	3.5%	2.1%	13.7%
1	650	Providence, RI	-5.7%	-6.9%	-10.7%	-7.0%	1.1%	16.2%	-6.2%	14.8%	-1.7%
1	689	West Haven, CT	-13.5%	0.5%	-4.6%	-7.1%	-9.7%	3.3%	9.7%	8.6%	8.6%
1	405	White River Jnct., VT	n.a.	***	***	program closed	***	***	-21.7%	-14.0%	-7.3%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	13.1%	-3.5%	-15.3%	-10.0%	-15.6%	-15.3%	0.0%	10.1%	0.0%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	17.4%	15.2%	-8.5%	-3.4%	-17.6%	-22.3%	3.5%	16.2%	18.2%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	31.7%	18.9%	25.2%	16.7%	8.5%	15.1%	-2.9%	0.1%	-4.6%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	-18.1%	7.3%	0.0%	-16.3%	-17.4%	-19.3%	-10.7%	-12.3%	-0.5%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	6.8%	10.9%	11.4%	-4.8%	16.7%	16.8%	0.8%	-3.5%	8.1%
3	526	Bronx, NY	43.6%	0.0%	17.6%	23.5%	9.8%	8.5%	12.0%	6.8%	2.4%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	n.a.	8.8%	5.3%	21.5%	9.2%	-3.9%	4.5%	16.2%	5.5%
3	561A	East Orange, NJ	26.7%	-6.8%	see above	see above	-25.5%	-13.6%	-3.0%	-16.7%	-24.6%
3	561B	Lyons, NJ	0.9%	-10.3%	see above	see above	-17.0%	-20.6%	-21.0%	-21.4%	-18.7%
3	620	Montrose, NY	7.1%	0.8%	8.0%	0.0%	-2.2%	-2.1%	1.2%	-3.0%	2.2%
3	561	New Jersey HCS	see below	see below	-3.5%	-1.4%	see below	see below	see below	see below	see below
3	632	Northport, NY	26.2%	1.9%	9.1%	***	7.8%	2.9%	-9.2%	7.5%	15.5%
4	529	Butler, PA	***	22.9%	36.6%	15.4%	13.4%	-2.2%	13.7%	34.3%	-17.2%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	-3.3%	0.4%	8.0%	-13.9%	-20.0%	-19.2%	-5.9%	-12.4%	program closed
4	595	Lebanon, PA	17.4%	24.5%	27.2%	21.5%	14.0%	19.8%	25.4%	8.8%	program closed
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	***	30.3%	2.6%	56.0%	34.0%	-15.6%	program closed	program closed	program closed
4	656A5	Pittsburgh, PA	0.0%	-2.2%	-6.3%	0.9%	-10.6%	-15.8%	-1.1%	3.5%	11.7%
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	-13.1%	-7.3%	-14.7%	***
5	512	Baltimore, MD	***	21.1%	23.8%	16.6%	14.4%	-19.2%	-25.0%	-14.6%	-9.8%
5	512A4	Fort Howard, MD	n.a.	***	-15.0%	15.9%	***	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	n.a.	***	-14.7%	-0.6%	-12.4%	-14.9%	-0.6%	-0.2%	2.1%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	-4.9%	15.7%	11.0%	***	8.5%	21.0%	31.3%	14.3%	-17.5%
5	688	Washington DC	0.5%	39.4%	12.4%	21.6%	16.1%	15.2%	10.1%	11.7%	13.4%
6	637	Asheville, NC	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	-13.2%	-14.0%	-14.7%	-0.5%	1.0%
6	558	Durham, NC	-13.9%	-16.2%	-13.0%	-18.4%	-15.9%	***	program closed	program closed	program closed
6	590	Hampton, VA	-9.4%	16.9%	-3.2%	12.8%	-6.7%	7.8%	0.5%	0.0%	9.7%
6	652	Richmond, VA	41.6%	4.2%	32.4%	program closed	***	46.4%	45.4%	20.3%	34.6%
6	658	Salem, VA	14.8%	-0.8%	20.6%	38.4%	17.7%	21.2%	22.1%	8.9%	19.0%
6	659	Salisbury, NC	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	***	***
7	508	Atlanta, GA	-17.6%	-15.9%	-8.5%	-18.5%	-10.0%	-4.0%	-8.9%	-7.6%	-8.6%
7	509	Augusta, GA	-18.9%	-3.4%	-2.3%	-6.3%	-1.5%	11.1%	3.9%	1.3%	-5.2%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	n.a.	n.a.	-12.1%	-13.7%	-22.9%	-18.1%	-9.4%	-15.5%	***
7	534	Charleston, SC	-4.3%	-14.5%	-11.4%	-19.7%	-18.1%	-15.7%	-19.6%	-9.7%	-14.9%
7	544	Columbia, SC	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	8.3%	28.4%	30.0%	19.8%
7	557	Dublin, GA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-12.1%	***	18.2%	21.4%	2.6%	-7.9%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	0.4%	9.1%	6.0%	16.0%	4.6%	-2.1%	-19.3%	-21.7%	-15.7%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	26.6%	8.9%	-3.1%	-8.5%	6.1%

Table 37g cont. Adjusted Unemployed at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY98 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY99 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY00 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY01 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY02 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY03 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY04 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY05 Unemployed at Discharge %
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	2.3%	-6.4%	-6.6%	11.0%	-9.1%	-21.8%	-7.6%	-6.3%	-15.7%
8	573A	Gainesville, FL	***	-2.9%	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above
8	573B	Lake City, FL	***	-2.6%	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above
8	546	Miami, FL	-7.1%	-13.3%	-9.6%	-8.2%	-12.8%	-17.5%	-5.9%	-10.1%	***
8	573	N.FL/S.GA VHS	see below	see below	-8.8%	-14.3%	-23.8%	-14.4%	-23.8%	-23.1%	-13.0%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL								-10.5%	-21.6%
8	673	Tampa, FL	10.5%	-18.2%	-19.6%	-9.5%	-20.0%	-15.6%	5.8%	2.4%	15.1%
8	548	W. Palm Beach, FL	n.a.	***	-7.3%	4.4%	-26.4%	-1.3%	-20.1%	-17.9%	-18.0%
9	596	Lexington, KY†††	-6.3%	7.0%	3.9%	11.6%	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	-0.5%
9	603	Louisville, KY	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-15.6%
9	614	Memphis, TN	***	25.0%	-1.6%	4.6%	-7.7%	-18.7%	4.9%	22.8%	19.0%
9	621	Mt. Home, TN	-1.8%	15.3%	6.0%	8.7%	4.2%	8.2%	3.1%	-4.6%	2.8%
9	622	Murfreesboro, TN	1.9%	22.9%	20.4%	20.4%	13.4%	8.1%	13.9%	13.5%	8.4%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	-1.4%	-12.7%	2.4%	2.9%	6.6%	-19.0%	-15.3%	-13.1%	-17.4%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-21.4%	-20.5%	-3.4%	-2.4%	10.9%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	22.7%	7.5%	0.7%	25.6%	17.4%	18.1%	2.1%	10.2%	5.1%
10	756	Columbus, OH								***	***
10	552	Dayton, OH	-14.1%	***	0.2%	-1.1%	-5.6%	-7.0%	-7.2%	***	-8.2%
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	n.a.	***	***	***	***	23.1%	22.9%	25.2%	39.2%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	11.5%	11.7%	12.2%	11.6%	11.9%	-1.6%	-11.8%	1.0%	-2.6%
11	550	Danville, IL	16.8%	***	-18.4%	19.1%	-5.6%	20.2%	-11.3%	-0.7%	-6.2%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	n.a.	-4.1%	1.0%	9.4%	7.6%	9.6%	-9.2%	-7.1%	9.9%
12	578	Hines, IL	-17.6%	7.8%	-0.9%	5.8%	-4.3%	-2.6%	-0.6%	-20.5%	9.5%
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	program closed	program closed	program closed
12	607	Madison, WI	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	18.1%	10.7%	7.3%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	7.9%	4.7%	3.4%	2.0%	8.3%	14.5%	19.3%	21.6%	-0.5%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	-5.2%	***	9.2%	5.0%	5.3%	-0.2%	12.7%	7.0%	-2.9%
12	676	Tomah, WI	16.7%	7.5%	-2.3%	28.1%	12.3%	7.5%	10.3%	5.7%	7.8%
15	589A4	Columbia, MO	***	***	18.2%	***	***	***	***	3.4%	***
15	589	Kansas City, KS	-0.5%	20.3%	32.1%	23.5%	***	***	5.5%	-8.7%	-12.9%
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	19.9%	0.1%	-9.0%	0.1%	-2.6%	-19.8%	1.9%	-13.4%	-7.1%
15	647	Poplar Bluff, MO	***	-2.4%	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
15	657	St. Louis, MO	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	***	***	***
15	677	Topeka, KS	see below	see below	see below	see below	19.0%	13.1%	26.3%	17.5%	6.8%
16	520	Biloxi, MI	35.5%	15.8%	10.4%	28.1%	15.3%	14.2%	16.2%	24.0%	15.7%
16	580	Houston, TX	-12.7%	-12.1%	-6.6%	-4.9%	-15.4%	2.1%	3.6%	-3.5%	-5.6%
16	586	Jackson, MS	***	30.6%	28.6%	-4.0%	18.3%	43.1%	-2.7%	20.0%	14.8%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	-3.1%	8.5%	9.9%	12.6%	10.7%	4.3%	9.7%	6.2%	3.1%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	24.8%	-10.0%	***	4.5%	-1.3%	-3.1%	2.0%	11.7%	15.0%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	n.a.	-1.2%	-1.8%	3.4%	0.5%	-0.4%	2.6%	-9.5%	-10.3%
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX	see Dallas	see Dallas	see Dallas	see Dallas	see Dallas	see Dallas	see Dallas	see Dallas	19.4%
17	549	Dallas, TX	6.2%	3.6%	6.9%	20.1%	12.5%	26.6%	6.3%	8.5%	26.6%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	17.8%	23.0%	-6.5%	-9.0%	-10.5%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	12.8%	11.4%	1.4%	13.3%	-19.3%	-16.6%	-10.4%	-20.9%	-9.1%
17	674	Temple, TX	-2.0%	28.2%	37.3%	2.3%	-24.8%	1.1%	12.8%	11.2%	11.4%
17	674A4	Waco, TX	6.3%	-2.9%	***	***	10.6%	***	program closed	program closed	program closed

Table 37g cont. Adjusted Unemployed at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY98 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY99 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY00 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY01 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY02 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY03 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY04 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY05 Unemployed at Discharge %
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	20.6%	-5.3%	-13.6%	-14.3%	-4.2%
18	756	El Paso	n.a.	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	n.a.	***	-6.6%	-8.7%	-7.7%	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed
18	649	Prescott, AZ	22.8%	37.8%	24.4%	22.0%	28.9%	23.5%	25.3%	19.5%	15.7%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	-4.9%	3.8%	-3.2%	-3.9%	0.0%	3.2%	2.3%	-3.1%	0.1%
19	554GE	Col. Springs, CO	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	-15.3%	***	***
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	-18.9%	-9.0%	-18.7%	-20.1%	-14.6%	-1.5%	-9.6%	-15.4%	-3.5%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	n.a.	-3.3%	21.1%	-20.7%	***	***	-25.8%	***	-24.5%
20	663A4	Am. Lake, WA	13.1%	14.2%	-0.9%	-0.5%	0.5%	-6.6%	23.5%	-7.1%	-8.0%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	26.3%	21.0%	-3.5%	-4.7%	-7.8%	-21.3%	-8.6%	-5.8%	-16.3%
20	648	Portland, OR	18.8%	26.3%	11.7%	-4.9%	8.3%	9.5%	7.3%	4.7%	-9.5%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	11.0%	28.0%	19.0%	20.5%	52.9%	***	-4.5%	***	***
20	663	Seattle, WA	-6.6%	21.0%	***	***	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-7.3%	-0.3%	-5.2%	***
20	692	White City, OR	-6.7%	3.0%	-3.7%	11.6%	-14.0%	-1.1%	-13.5%	-13.3%	-12.6%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	-12.9%	6.4%	-11.4%	-13.2%	10.7%	1.6%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	***	30.4%	2.9%	-3.1%	1.7%	11.2%	0.9%	0.0%	11.2%
21	654	Reno, NV	***	***	***	-11.2%	-6.2%	***	10.7%	-23.3%	-12.7%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	4.0%	6.7%	14.2%	1.6%	2.1%	7.8%	5.1%	11.5%	16.3%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	-22.6%	-10.2%	-6.3%	-8.6%	-19.9%	-22.7%	-21.8%	-23.4%	-17.3%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	15.8%	-2.0%	-3.5%	4.7%	-7.9%	-14.2%	-11.5%	-3.4%	-11.1%
22	664	San Diego, CA	n.a.	***	-23.8%	-4.7%	-20.0%	-14.4%	-2.7%	5.1%	-12.3%
22	691A4	Sepulveda, CA	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
22	691	West LA, CA	***	***	1.1%	-5.8%	***	-9.6%	1.3%	-6.8%	***
23	636A6	Des Moines, IA	n.a.	***	-2.6%	-11.8%	***	***	program closed	program closed	program closed
23	437	Fargo, ND	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	2.4%
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	4.4%	0.4%	-16.6%	-7.8%	-12.9%	4.3%	-2.5%	-18.6%	-1.1%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	17.4%	10.2%	18.8%	12.5%	9.4%	9.7%	-0.9%	-11.2%	-3.8%
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	4.8%	-12.0%	-2.4%	-4.9%	-20.8%	-17.5%	-3.9%	***	***
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-5.7%	-26.0%	-10.5%	-8.5%	-3.5%	-14.9%
23	636	Omaha, NE	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.		-8.3%
23	438	Sioux Falls, SD	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	19.5%	26.0%	***	***	***
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	-0.5%	10.4%	0.9%	8.1%	15.4%	31.1%	25.3%	22.0%	16.5%

† Improvement in unemployment has been adjusted for veteran characteristics which vary within each fiscal year.

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

††† Lexington closed but reopened in FY05.

*** Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than ten (10).

Table 37h. Adjusted Employment Status Unknown at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY98 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY99 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY00 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY01 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY02 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY03 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY04 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY05 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %
1	518	Bedford, MA	53.6%	42.8%	22.6%	14.4%	17.6%	12.6%	6.8%	8.2%	9.8%
1	523	Boston, MA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-14.3%	-9.7%	-11.0%	-4.4%	-6.6%	4.4%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	-2.7%	6.9%	5.8%	4.8%	10.0%	-5.4%	-6.5%	-5.0%	-2.6%
1	608	Manchester, NH	-6.1%	***	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed
1	631	Northampton, MA	4.5%	15.1%	13.3%	5.1%	1.7%	0.4%	4.1%	9.0%	5.3%
1	650	Providence, RI	13.8%	17.4%	6.1%	-2.8%	-3.7%	8.4%	4.6%	3.9%	4.9%
1	689	West Haven, CT	17.6%	10.6%	-7.3%	6.1%	0.0%	-3.2%	-5.9%	-7.7%	-3.3%
1	405	White River Jnct., VT	n.a.	***	***	program closed	***	***	-1.6%	-7.5%	-2.2%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	4.6%	12.4%	19.4%	7.6%	-2.0%	8.3%	2.0%	-2.8%	-4.8%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	-14.7%	49.5%	-7.9%	-2.6%	-3.4%	-1.0%	1.5%	-8.6%	-8.9%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	-11.1%	-5.4%	-7.5%	-8.9%	2.8%	-8.5%	4.6%	-6.9%	0.7%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	28.2%	20.9%	8.0%	8.6%	0.9%	10.1%	-5.0%	5.2%	11.8%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	-8.2%	-0.6%	4.8%	-4.8%	-8.8%	-10.7%	-4.3%	-3.7%	-3.0%
3	526	Bronx, NY	-5.8%	-9.7%	-10.9%	-13.2%	-12.0%	-10.2%	-7.1%	-5.7%	-5.1%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	n.a.	-4.7%	-13.0%	-12.7%	4.3%	1.0%	6.6%	0.3%	11.5%
3	561A	East Orange, NJ	-15.1%	-2.3%	see above	see above	-2.3%	-10.8%	5.9%	-3.3%	5.8%
3	561B	Lyons, NJ	-0.6%	0.0%	see above	see above	2.0%	-8.4%	-8.5%	-10.1%	-6.6%
3	620	Montrose, NY	1.9%	11.8%	9.9%	8.9%	12.4%	3.5%	10.5%	3.6%	1.7%
3	561	New Jersey HCS	see below	see below	0.1%	1.9%	see below	see below	see below	see below	see below
3	632	Northport, NY	-4.5%	19.4%	-10.6%	-15.2%	25.5%	14.6%	2.3%	10.7%	-1.0%
4	529	Butler, PA	***	-5.1%	-13.2%	-13.9%	-11.6%	-10.8%	-8.8%	-1.8%	0.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	0.9%	-8.1%	-11.4%	8.6%	18.8%	20.4%	15.9%	20.5%	31.0%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	-11.1%	-4.7%	-11.3%	-11.7%	-9.6%	-9.9%	-4.7%	-2.3%	-0.5%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	***	-10.2%	-13.9%	-14.0%	-12.5%	-10.5%	program closed	program closed	program closed
4	656A5	Pittsburgh, PA	-1.8%	10.8%	0.9%	6.9%	2.2%	3.4%	9.4%	-8.1%	-7.4%
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	-2.3%	5.0%	0.7%	***
5	512	Baltimore, MD	***	-10.0%	-6.7%	-13.0%	4.2%	-7.1%	-1.2%	2.5%	4.8%
5	512A4	Fort Howard, MD	n.a.	***	-12.9%	-14.1%	***	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	n.a.	***	-5.6%	-10.5%	0.5%	-2.8%	0.0%	0.5%	-1.5%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	-8.2%	13.7%	-10.8%	17.2%	-7.0%	0.0%	-4.6%	-3.5%	10.6%
5	688	Washington DC	-8.3%	-9.4%	-13.1%	-13.4%	-12.2%	-9.8%	-8.9%	-6.7%	-2.5%
6	637	Asheville, NC	***	***	***	34.3%	9.2%	-5.3%	1.0%	8.5%	7.4%
6	558	Durham, NC	-2.3%	3.2%	-3.1%	13.2%	7.4%	***	program closed	program closed	program closed
6	590	Hampton, VA	0.0%	-2.9%	-3.0%	-3.5%	-3.5%	-2.9%	-6.9%	-2.9%	-7.0%
6	652	Richmond, VA	-11.4%	4.0%	-12.9%	program closed	***	-11.6%	-10.3%	-11.6%	2.9%
6	658	Salem, VA	18.1%	5.0%	-12.7%	-12.8%	-10.0%	-1.3%	-8.0%	-11.2%	-7.7%
6	659	Salisbury, NC	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	***	***
7	508	Atlanta, GA	28.5%	34.8%	22.4%	28.5%	18.0%	-1.3%	5.3%	6.8%	9.2%
7	509	Augusta, GA	-5.9%	19.4%	5.7%	0.2%	-6.0%	-8.1%	-0.2%	0.7%	2.5%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	n.a.	n.a.	-8.8%	6.2%	8.7%	27.5%	2.5%	2.2%	***
7	534	Charleston, SC	20.6%	17.5%	12.9%	-1.6%	4.3%	9.1%	7.9%	-0.1%	-0.1%
7	544	Columbia, SC	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	1.5%	-8.3%	-7.5%	-5.2%
7	557	Dublin, GA	n.a.	n.a.	***	1.1%	***	-11.0%	-2.9%	9.4%	5.1%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	2.7%	13.6%	8.2%	2.1%	-3.6%	7.2%	-1.8%	-5.9%	-3.4%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	21.7%	10.4%	1.4%	-0.4%	-1.0%

Table 37h cont. Adjusted Employment Status Unknown at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY98 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY99 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY00 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY01 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY02 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY032 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY04 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY05 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	1.5%	18.7%	19.0%	-0.4%	16.9%	30.2%	5.2%	-0.01	3.3%
8	573A	Gainesville, FL	***	5.1%	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above
8	573B	Lake City, FL	***	-1.6%	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above	see above
8	546	Miami, FL	-6.9%	24.1%	11.8%	2.7%	1.1%	10.4%	3.6%	0.16	***
8	573	N.FL/S.GA VHS	see below	see below	5.0%	9.3%	7.4%	9.4%	14.5%	0.09	7.6%
8	673OR	Orlando, FL								0.33	-9.0%
8	673	Tampa, FL	1.3%	11.4%	15.8%	3.1%	3.8%	-3.6%	-8.3%	0.10	0.3%
8	548	W. Palm Beach, FL	n.a.	***	24.2%	-4.6%	-0.7%	0.0%	15.9%	0.02	16.3%
9	596	Lexington, KY†††	14.9%	23.3%	11.9%	-0.6%	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	18.0%
9	603	Louisville, KY	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-8.2%
9	614	Memphis, TN	***	-1.6%	2.9%	5.6%	6.8%	2.1%	22.3%	-0.13	1.0%
9	621	Mt. Home, TN	12.5%	19.9%	19.1%	11.1%	10.5%	4.9%	16.5%	0.25	15.6%
9	622	Murfreesboro, TN	12.8%	-0.4%	-8.8%	-9.6%	-10.6%	0.5%	6.5%	-0.25	6.1%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	2.3%	-0.1%	-1.5%	-8.2%	-3.7%	-1.9%	0.6%	0.22	-3.4%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-10.5%	2.6%	6.0%	0.17	0.0%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	-10.1%	5.7%	-0.8%	-7.6%	-9.4%	-2.4%	7.9%	0.26	5.4%
10	756	Columbus, OH								***	***
10	552	Dayton, OH	15.6%	***	2.0%	-13.3%	1.5%	7.4%	-3.1%	***	16.8%
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	***	-5.8%	-7.4%	-0.42	-6.8%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	1.0%	-2.4%	-6.1%	-11.9%	-10.6%	18.0%	1.9%	-0.10	15.3%
11	550	Danville, IL	21.8%	***	5.2%	17.6%	1.5%	-0.7%	-6.7%	-0.12	-6.6%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	n.a.	-0.4%	2.4%	-0.8%	-9.0%	-8.7%	10.9%	-0.19	-2.9%
12	578	Hines, IL	18.3%	28.0%	10.5%	-2.0%	12.2%	4.3%	4.9%	-0.07	0.4%
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	-8.6%	***	***
12	607	Madison, WI	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	6.3%	0.06	-0.9%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	-10.1%	4.3%	-5.9%	-2.9%	0.5%	4.1%	***	0.17	-0.5%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	41.8%	***	-8.2%	-13.1%	-10.9%	-10.9%	-8.5%	0.31	-8.6%
12	676	Tomah, WI	-2.0%	0.6%	-3.1%	-7.3%	-11.8%	0.9%	4.5%	0.10	-5.0%
15	589A4	Columbia, MO	***	***	8.0%	***	***	***	***	-0.01	***
15	589	Kansas City, KS	26.2%	-6.3%	-9.2%	0.0%	***	***	6.1%	0.03	6.2%
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	11.7%	9.6%	22.8%	17.2%	9.3%	30.2%	8.1%	0.31	22.1%
15	647	Poplar Bluff, MO	***	36.8%	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
15	657	St. Louis, MO	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	***	***	***
15	677	Topeka, KS	see below	see below	see below	see below	5.5%	14.2%	-1.5%	-0.35	8.9%
16	520	Biloxi, MI	-6.9%	2.4%	-2.1%	-5.1%	-8.0%	-6.9%	-0.9%	0.05	3.7%
16	580	Houston, TX	2.6%	-2.2%	2.9%	-2.5%	3.2%	4.9%	8.4%	0.05	0.7%
16	586	Jackson, MS	***	-4.5%	-4.3%	11.5%	-4.8%	13.4%	-3.1%	-0.56	-0.5%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	17.1%	-3.8%	-5.4%	-11.7%	-10.2%	-1.9%	-2.3%	-0.27	0.0%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	-0.9%	48.3%	***	33.4%	23.0%	7.8%	8.0%	-0.01	15.9%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	n.a.	-1.1%	-6.8%	-5.5%	-7.0%	-1.9%	-0.1%	0.27	-4.2%
17	549DT	Dallas (downtown), TX	see Dallas	see Dallas	see Dallas	see Dallas	see Dallas	see Dallas	see Dallas	see Dallas	18.6%
17	549	Dallas, TX	10.1%	15.4%	15.8%	5.2%	10.7%	5.5%	22.5%	-0.39	2.5%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-3.6%	-8.1%	15.8%	0.00	7.1%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	-11.8%	4.6%	3.6%	-0.2%	14.5%	11.2%	16.9%	0.07	33.9%
17	674	Temple, TX	13.5%	18.2%	0.0%	24.5%	9.4%	1.8%	4.2%	0.05	-2.9%
17	674A4	Waco, TX	-4.4%	16.5%	***	***	5.7%	***	program closed	program closed	program closed

Table 37h cont. Adjusted Employment Status Unknown at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year †, ††

VISN		SITE	FY96 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY98 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY99 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY00 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY01 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY02 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY03 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY04 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY05 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	-12.4%	13.4%	18.6%	9.4%	19.8%
18	756	El Paso	n.a.	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	n.a.	***	-7.7%	-1.2%	-2.7%	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed
18	649	Prescott, AZ	-7.5%	-4.0%	-10.2%	-0.6%	-9.4%	-6.8%	-7.5%	-8.4%	-3.8%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	14.1%	27.3%	8.3%	9.8%	5.6%	14.7%	13.6%	11.7%	9.8%
19	554GE	Col. Springs, CO	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	-7.9%	***	***
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	9.6%	0.6%	-5.7%	8.6%	-5.4%	14.2%	-3.1%	4.7%	-4.8%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	n.a.	8.3%	5.3%	41.1%	***	***	53.0%	***	39.7%
20	663A4	Am. Lake, WA	-11.7%	-1.2%	-2.8%	-7.4%	-5.9%	-6.0%	-2.3%	-4.2%	6.3%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	0.0%	2.1%	34.9%	-8.7%	17.2%	24.0%	14.4%	18.7%	-1.3%
20	648	Portland, OR	-3.4%	-8.4%	-6.1%	-4.2%	-4.9%	5.0%	2.5%	3.1%	0.8%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	-6.0%	0.9%	3.2%	6.3%	-10.4%	***	2.7%	***	***
20	663	Seattle, WA	5.6%	-9.3%	***	***	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed	program closed
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	15.3%	-0.7%	-8.9%	***
20	692	White City, OR	9.1%	3.3%	3.3%	-6.3%	16.9%	0.2%	0.1%	-0.5%	6.7%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	-13.4%	-13.3%	-4.4%	-8.1%	11.3%	-6.4%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	***	-0.8%	3.4%	3.9%	-1.4%	2.9%	10.7%	0.6%	0.0%
21	654	Reno, NV	***	***	***	22.4%	-5.0%	***	-1.8%	41.2%	-4.1%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	0.6%	-0.6%	1.6%	15.0%	27.3%	14.9%	10.5%	-1.2%	3.4%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	-5.4%	0.7%	2.0%	-1.7%	5.0%	-2.7%	0.7%	1.8%	1.3%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	0.5%	4.7%	-10.4%	4.3%	-7.4%	6.2%	2.0%	-9.3%	-3.0%
22	664	San Diego, CA	n.a.	***	-3.0%	0.7%	-7.7%	-4.7%	0.5%	2.6%	-2.9%
22	691A4	Sepulveda, CA	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
22	691	West LA, CA	***	***	45.3%	5.0%	***	-5.9%	0.9%	-9.6%	***
23	636A6	Des Moines, IA	n.a.	***	2.6%	-9.0%	***	***	program closed	program closed	program closed
23	437	Fargo, ND	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***	-1.7%
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	18.9%	27.7%	1.6%	-5.6%	-2.0%	-3.1%	-2.6%	12.7%	21.7%
23	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	-6.3%	-1.3%	-10.3%	-8.6%	-7.0%	-1.0%	-4.0%	-1.1%	11.7%
23	636A7	Knoxville, IA	22.3%	10.9%	-1.1%	5.7%	16.2%	6.8%	1.7%	***	***
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-5.4%	13.4%	15.2%	9.0%	16.6%	14.3%
23	636	Omaha, NE	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	8.0%
23	438	Sioux Falls, SD	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-0.4%	-11.6%	***	***	***
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	15.5%	8.2%	4.5%	-0.6%	1.2%	-5.5%	-3.9%	-2.0%	2.4%

† Improvement in employment unknown category has been adjusted for veteran characteristics and these characteristics vary within each fiscal year.

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

††† Lexington closed but reopened in FY05.

*** Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than ten (10).

Appendix C: Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Data Tables

List of Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Tables

Appendix C.1 Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by VISN †

VISN	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of PSR Stops	Average Duration (in days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop
1	2,245	25.95	133.17
2	1,970	15.44	83.78
3	2,283	38.52	115.00
4	1,056	37.57	89.64
5	1,471	29.54	94.74
6	965	42.21	93.81
7	2,627	18.30	85.54
8	2,561	15.28	62.44
9	1,133	8.61	64.36
10	4,042	26.42	81.11
11	1,629	25.63	72.61
12	2,051	59.23	122.91
15	1,626	31.66	91.66
16	3,085	28.56	84.31
17	2,080	23.81	91.28
18	1,807	18.36	72.47
19	622	12.93	50.93
20	1,362	18.47	74.17
21	801	20.91	79.13
22	2,074	28.44	105.34
23	2,214	36.16	92.58
All VA	**39,704**	**27.17**	**89.57**
VISN Avg	**1,891**	**26.76**	**87.67**
VISN SD	**789**	**11.36**	**19.31**

† Includes stop codes 574 - group CWT, 532 individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 559 - group Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 573 group IT, 535 individual Vocational Assistance, 575 - group Vocational Assistance, 208 Rehabilitation Medicine Service CWT, 207 Rehabilitation Medicine Service IT and 213 Rehabilitation Medicine Service Vocational Assistance.

Appendix C.2 CWT and CWT/TR Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by VISN†

VISN	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of CWT &/or CWT/TR Stops	Average Duration (in days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop
1	1,575	23.98	167.57
2	995	20.12	109.38
3	1,737	31.69	142.06
4	658	33.83	105.29
5	751	31.06	110.73
6	342	41.91	111.16
7	1,893	13.12	111.28
8	680	29.58	122.85
9	402	12.99	118.33
10	3,032	23.74	106.57
11	976	19.25	84.75
12	1,240	61.32	135.22
15	666	21.23	125.54
16	965	35.65	108.31
17	1,345	31.20	124.15
18	1,184	22.07	116.32
19	372	13.63	88.03
20	438	28.06	101.32
21	678	20.26	140.76
22	1,417	27.62	135.93
23	1,519	33.61	105.31
All VA	**22,865**	**22,865**	**27.45**
VISN Avg	**1089**	**27.42**	**117.66**
VISN SD	**628**	**10.74**	**18.69**

† Includes stop codes 574 - group CWT, 532 - individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 559 - group Psychosocial Rehabilitation and 208 Rehabilitation Medicine Service CWT.

Appendix C.3 Incentive Work Therapy (IT) Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by VISN †

VISN	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of IT Stops	Average Duration among Veterans with more than 1 Stop
1	414	33.14	196.22
2	801	2.08	133.76
3	436	47.82	124.23
4	316	37.42	87.28
5	451	33.20	129.96
6	407	44.90	139.44
7	426	36.77	142.45
8	226	29.87	126.30
9	519	6.99	84.18
10	1038	27.66	111.04
11	287	60.89	132.60
12	643	50.12	140.85
15	673	52.41	102.07
16	1085	26.98	86.97
17	181	8.45	85.37
18	253	15.36	97.97
19	58	32.91	70.72
20	261	12.75	121.83
21	81	33.56	132.98
22	254	26.56	116.88
23	508	47.53	127.12
All VA	**9,318**	**31.61**	**117.36**
VISN Avg	**444**	**31.78**	**118.58**
VISN SD	**271**	**15.58**	**27.41**

† Includes stop code 573 - group IT and 207 Rehabilitation Medicine Service IT.

Appendix C.4 Vocational Assistance Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by VISN †

VISN	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of Vocational Assistance Stops	Average Duration (in days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop
1	730	9.28	117.46
2	1,651	5.29	97.51
3	1,012	11.90	88.16
4	622	8.97	70.76
5	1,069	4.82	112.05
6	660	12.31	98.18
7	1,578	4.79	81.57
8	2,172	5.65	90.01
9	380	2.39	88.65
10	1,376	4.44	77.21
11	883	6.22	103.18
12	1,455	9.08	104.40
15	806	2.56	62.65
16	2,514	9.72	96.29
17	1,022	5.91	76.73
18	1,172	2.69	86.46
19	302	3.52	109.27
20	1,032	9.24	94.39
21	190	1.56	61.62
22	1,179	11.12	111.58
23	1,047	4.64	84.29
All VA	**22,852**	**6.85**	**92.57**
VISN Avg	**1088**	**6.48**	**91.07**
VISN SD	**560**	**3.23**	**15.43**

† Includes stop codes 535 - individual Vocational Assistance, 575 - group Vocational ssistance and 213 Rehabilitation Medicine Service Vocational Assistance.

Appendix C.5 Type of Service Veterans Received First in the Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Continuum of Care during FY 2004 by VISN

VISN	# of Veterans Treated	% Received CWT &/or CWT/TR Services First	% Received IT Services First	% Received Vocational Assistance Services First
1	2245	61.2%	14.3%	25.8%
2	1970	40.4%	7.2%	54.1%
3	2283	60.5%	10.0%	31.5%
4	1056	38.7%	15.5%	51.7%
5	1471	33.7%	17.3%	51.3%
6	965	18.1%	31.5%	53.9%
7	2627	58.8%	11.9%	32.5%
8	2561	16.4%	6.7%	78.1%
9	1133	25.5%	43.4%	31.5%
10	4042	71.1%	14.3%	15.8%
11	1629	49.5%	7.7%	44.6%
12	2051	42.9%	24.2%	44.8%
15	1626	35.6%	27.6%	37.5%
16	3085	16.3%	18.3%	68.3%
17	2080	55.4%	5.2%	41.0%
18	1807	53.3%	3.7%	44.1%
19	622	53.2%	2.7%	44.7%
20	1362	19.8%	13.4%	67.8%
21	801	78.0%	6.1%	16.4%
22	2074	56.1%	6.0%	42.3%
23	2214	54.6%	11.7%	36.4%
All VA	**39,704**	**45.9%**	**13.6%**	**43.0%**
VISN Avg	**1891**	**44.7%**	**14.2%**	**43.5%**
VISN SD	**789**	**17.7%**	**10.0%**	**15.5%**

Appendix C.6 Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site †

VISN	SITE		# of Veterans Treated	Average # of PSR Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
1	402	Togus, ME	94	50.27	192.44
1	405	White River Junction, VT	91	15.33	83.70
1	518	Bedford, MA	747	33.16	151.53
1	523	Boston, MA	339	22.18	153.20
1	631	Northampton, MA	239	29.93	137.77
1	650	Providence, RI	315	26.04	107.97
1	689	West Haven, CT	420	10.71	98.09
2	528	Upstate NY HCS	1,970	15.44	83.78
3	526	Bronx, NY	414	18.51	82.57
3	561	E. Orange, NY	684	26.45	114.91
3	620	Montrose, NY	269	63.05	118.78
3	630	New York, NY	403	32.69	97.79
3	632	Northport, NY	513	62.47	152.84
4	529	Butler, PA	131	18.26	78.02
4	540	Clarksburg, WV	3	1.33	0.67
4	542	Coatesville, PA	235	29.97	74.48
4	595	Lebanon, PA	175	63.42	106.87
4	646	Pittsburgh, PA	409	44.15	96.98
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	103	10.43	83.22
5	512	Baltimore, MD	694	40.97	109.33
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	391	9.96	74.30
5	688	Washington DC	386	28.82	89.22
6	558	Durham, NC	159	40.77	73.11
6	590	Hampton, VA	440	44.80	94.22
6	652	Richmond, VA	105	14.48	84.94
6	658	Salem, VA	167	65.56	125.41
6	659	Salisbury, NC	94	22.02	80.72
7	508	Atlanta, GA	371	23.45	81.94
7	509	Augusta, GA	461	28.23	111.04
7	521	Birmingham, AL	89	7.67	155.26
7	534	Charleston, SC	122	5.52	99.67
7	544	Columbia, SC	451	10.39	57.54
7	557	Dublin, GA	215	12.98	63.41
7	619	Montgomery, AL	450	17.78	96.22
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	468	20.34	73.25
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	411	20.77	85.75
8	546	Miami, FL	296	17.18	90.74
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	275	22.64	46.45
8	573	Gainesville, FL	628	13.46	81.44
8	673	Tampa, FL	951	11.40	35.65
9	596	Lexington, KY	6	18.83	31.17
9	614	Memphis, TN	412	11.35	34.84
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	535	6.76	84.57
9	626	Murfreesboro, TN	180	7.52	72.96

Appendix C.6 cont. Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site †

VISN	SITE		# of Veterans Treated	Average # of PSR Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	988	23.75	76.21
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	400	26.08	75.13
10	541	Cleveland, OH	1,974	25.25	80.98
10	552	Dayton, OH	585	38.4	97.2
10	757	Columbus, OH	95	6.3	60.8
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	145	16.3	99.1
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	680	25.03	63.61
11	550	Danville, IL	190	49.17	104.12
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	334	35.92	86.46
11	610	Marion, IL	280	3.67	42.84
12	556	North Chicago, IL	511	44.90	106.40
12	578	Hines, IL	784	50.97	98.75
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	10	4.30	8.40
12	607	Madison, WI	191	26.90	91.86
12	676	Tomah, WI	256	82.28	179.48
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	299	108.11	189.74
15	589	Kansas City, MO	1,423	33.56	98.29
15	657	St. Louis, MO	203	18.35	45.21
16	502	Alexandria, LA	269	6.77	59.83
16	520	Biloxi, MS	350	42.52	103.73
16	580	Houston, TX	683	46.02	109.14
16	586	Jackson, MS	222	8.41	68.12
16	598	Little Rock, AR	1,204	23.46	73.92
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	119	10.73	75.00
16	667	Shreveport, LA	238	36.08	84.54
17	549	Dallas, TX	1,266	32.64	106.57
17	671	San Antonio, TX	351	12.84	66.66
17	674	Temple, TX	463	8.00	68.16
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	526	35.02	106.41
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	545	2.21	22.97
18	649	Prescott, AZ	558	9.33	80.96
18	678	Tucson, AZ	167	47.25	96.92
18	756	El Paso, TX	11	41.36	101.09
19	554	Denver, Co	307	2.19	28.24
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	308	23.90	74.46
19	666	Sheridan, WY	7	1.29	10.43
20	463	Anchorage, AK	85	12.42	79.71
20	531	Boise, ID	4	6.25	91.00
20	648	Portland, OR	545	20.76	61.93
20	653	Roseburg, OR	124	20.09	105.58
20	663	Seattle, WA	415	6.97	79.65
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	92	30.33	76.45
20	692	White City, OR	97	47.26	71.61
21	459	Honolulu, HI	86	58.15	120.50
21	612	Martinez, CA	204	2.25	13.45
21	640	Palo Alto	169	13.85	103.76
21	654	Reno, NV	99	52.72	124.42
21	662	San Francisco, CA	243	15.36	84.05

Appendix C.6 cont. Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site †

VISN	SITE		# of Veterans Treated	Average # of PSR Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
22	593	Las Vegas, NV	89	10.56	75.74
22	600	Long Beach, CA	970	19.95	92.30
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	288	27.03	122.58
22	664	San Diego, CA	138	9.59	109.05
22	691	West LA, CA	589	50.24	122.00
23	437	Fargo, ND	23	60.74	119.83
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	763	35.87	98.95
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	124	2.80	21.96
23	636	Des Moines, IA	529	34.45	85.49
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	775	42.22	101.65
All VA			39,704	27.17	89.57
Site Avg			389	26.34	87.77
Site SD			359	19.23	35.00

† Includes stop codes 574 - group CWT, 532 individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 559 - group Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 573 group IT, 535 individual Vocational Assistance, 575 - group Vocational Assistance, 208 Rehabilitation Medicine Service CWT, 207 Rehabilitation Medicine Service IT and 213 Rehabilitation Medicine Service Vocational Assistance.

Appendix C.7 CWT and CWT/TR Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site †

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of CWT &/or CWT/TR Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
1	402	Togus, ME	15	1.40	9.00
1	405	White River Junction, VT	91	15.30	109.44
1	518	Bedford, MA	717	26.80	184.77
1	523	Boston, MA	202	28.02	186.50
1	631	Northampton, MA	175	34.85	149.93
1	650	Providence, RI	277	17.53	171.37
1	689	West Haven, CT	98	5.39	81.65
2	528	Upstate NY HCS	995	20.12	109.38
3	526	Bronx, NY	414	16.79	133.92
3	561	E. Orange, NY	399	15.01	128.63
3	620	Montrose, NY	215	43.19	123.18
3	630	New York, NY	403	31.79	158.29
3	632	Northport, NY	306	65.39	163.47
4	529	Butler, PA	26	45.77	82.08
4	540	Clarksburg, WV	0		
4	542	Coatesville, PA	184	14.91	88.00
4	595	Lebanon, PA	147	40.13	112.30
4	646	Pittsburgh, PA	268	44.20	94.92
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	33	17.73	267.21
5	512	Baltimore, MD	274	37.36	99.75
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	241	12.88	85.45
5	688	Washington DC	236	42.30	151.27
6	558	Durham, NC	0		
6	590	Hampton, VA	205	37.78	109.58
6	652	Richmond, VA	34	14.56	96.12
6	658	Salem, VA	101	59.04	118.77
6	659	Salisbury, NC	2	64.50	240.00
7	508	Atlanta, GA	347	20.54	111.06
7	509	Augusta, GA	280	12.03	115.98
7	521	Birmingham, AL	89	7.65	181.82
7	534	Charleston, SC	117	4.28	126.32
7	544	Columbia, SC	305	12.22	91.20
7	557	Dublin, GA	34	16.94	76.17
7	619	Montgomery, AL	432	12.62	118.57
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	289	11.78	86.80
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	187	21.57	140.76
8	546	Miami, FL	190	14.62	132.05
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	79	68.11	95.65
8	573	Gainesville, FL	74	15.46	185.82
8	673	Tampa, FL	150	45.19	85.99
9	596	Lexington, KY	6	18.83	37.40
9	614	Memphis, TN	84	39.67	101.45
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	135	8.80	124.99
9	626	Murfreesboro, TN	177	3.33	127.16

Appendix C.7 cont.CWT and CWT/TR Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site †

VISN	SITE	SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of CWT &/or CWT/TR Stops	Average Duration among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	915	19.29	90.03
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	348	28.97	98.47
10	541	Cleveland, OH	1,570	25.50	119.35
10	552	Dayton, OH	118	31.7	112.8
10	757	Columbus, OH	81	5.7	81.8
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	53	13.0	61.6
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	658	9.74	61.08
11	550	Danville, IL	70	80.57	153.88
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	88	63.18	130.49
11	610	Marion, IL	107	4.57	179.93
12	556	North Chicago, IL	394	38.08	109.89
12	578	Hines, IL	453	76.88	126.97
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	10	4.30	9.33
12	607	Madison, WI	110	40.76	165.65
12	676	Tomah, WI	128	65.08	154.86
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	145	92.09	207.92
15	589	Kansas City, MO	645	20.56	125.33
15	657	St. Louis, MO	21	41.71	131.81
16	502	Alexandria, LA	2	26.00	61.00
16	520	Biloxi, MS	203	33.02	68.58
16	580	Houston, TX	285	54.79	135.47
16	586	Jackson, MS	222	8.25	110.11
16	598	Little Rock, AR	165	53.32	97.12
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	51	15.67	41.68
16	667	Shreveport, LA	37	16.30	250.64
17	549	Dallas, TX	1,222	33.25	127.13
17	671	San Antonio, TX	52	20.88	122.16
17	674	Temple, TX	71	3.38	19.29
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	379	36.72	160.88
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	131	3.51	50.18
18	649	Prescott, AZ	508	6.85	91.93
18	678	Tucson, AZ	155	50.46	123.29
18	756	El Paso, TX	11	41.36	123.56
19	554	Denver, Co	305	2.02	62.37
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	60	74.05	150.22
19	666	Sheridan, WY	7	1.29	36.50
20	463	Anchorage, AK	67	13.97	133.14
20	531	Boise, ID	4	6.25	121.33
20	648	Portland, OR	147	46.25	89.24
20	653	Roseburg, OR	42	33.86	141.15
20	663	Seattle, WA	113	9.18	67.16
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	33	22.39	119.88
20	692	White City, OR	32	41.63	96.46
21	459	Honolulu, HI	41	85.22	173.31
21	612	Martinez, CA	204	2.25	58.38
21	640	Palo Alto	153	15.13	148.20
21	654	Reno, NV	66	58.62	171.04
21	662	San Francisco, CA	214	16.83	141.54

Appendix C.7 cont.CWT and CWT/TR Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site †

VISN	SITE	SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of CWT &/or CWT/TR Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
22	593	Las Vegas, NV	89	10.46	89.88
22	600	Long Beach, CA	516	10.11	97.90
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	280	26.02	137.04
22	664	San Diego, CA	41	9.56	157.18
22	691	West LA, CA	491	51.55	174.77
23	437	Fargo, ND	23	60.74	131.24
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	751	22.24	109.47
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	37	5.92	40.41
23	636	Des Moines, IA	145	60.40	120.37
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	563	42.59	97.33
All VA			**22,865**	**27.45**	**119.97**
Site Avg			**227**	**29.09**	**116.66**
Site SD			**265**	**21.65**	**47.38**

† Includes stop codes 574 - group CWT, 532 - individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 559 - group Psychosocial Rehabilitation and 208 Rehabilitation Medicine Service CWT.

Appendix C.8 Incentive Work Therapy (IT) Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of IT Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
1	402	Togus, ME	30	76.20	212.81
1	405	White River Junction, VT	1	1.00	
1	518	Bedford, MA	42	130.69	297.46
1	523	Boston, MA	143	12.71	216.97
1	631	Northampton, MA	30	13.93	212.26
1	650	Providence, RI	114	27.94	150.86
1	689	West Haven, CT	54	9.69	115.28
2	528	Upstate NY HCS	801	2.08	133.76
3	526	Bronx, NY	48	12.83	53.67
3	561	E. Orange, NY	64	72.81	218.68
3	620	Montrose, NY	159	28.90	67.83
3	630	New York, NY	14	8.71	36.71
3	632	Northport, NY	151	71.91	174.60
4	529	Butler, PA	15	13.13	22.00
4	540	Clarksburg, WV	0		
4	542	Coatesville, PA	42	94.98	216.36
4	595	Lebanon, PA	96	27.09	44.47
4	646	Pittsburgh, PA	161	31.25	89.92
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	2	3.00	7.00
5	512	Baltimore, MD	261	55.50	147.82
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	167	2.52	87.24
5	688	Washington DC	23	2.78	56.57
6	558	Durham, NC	49	128.96	228.62
6	590	Hampton, VA	227	22.77	81.57
6	652	Richmond, VA	3	3.00	13.00
6	658	Salem, VA	67	74.21	192.47
6	659	Salisbury, NC	61	29.61	141.98
7	508	Atlanta, GA	0		
7	509	Augusta, GA	295	32.60	160.42
7	521	Birmingham, AL	0		
7	534	Charleston, SC	0		
7	544	Columbia, SC	0		
7	557	Dublin, GA	71	17.72	31.97
7	619	Montgomery, AL	1	1.00	
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	59	81.20	237.89
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	71	38.14	59.27
8	546	Miami, FL	126	12.17	150.48
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	0		
8	573	Gainesville, FL	0		
8	673	Tampa, FL	29	86.48	217.89
9	596	Lexington, KY	0		
9	614	Memphis, TN	18	26.61	100.81
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	496	4.86	81.47
9	626	Murfreesboro, TN	5	147.20	234.40

Appendix C.8 cont. Incentive Work Therapy (IT) Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of IT Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	91	48.82	187.93
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	51	1.82	80.00
10	541	Cleveland, OH	356	15.78	90.91
10	552	Dayton, OH	537	34.5	109.5
10	757	Columbus, OH	3	4.0	15.0
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	2	1.0	
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	95	109.58	232.71
11	550	Danville, IL	87	28.25	70.72
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	92	49.92	88.30
11	610	Marion, IL	11	1.00	
12	556	North Chicago, IL	407	17.40	100.87
12	578	Hines, IL	17	19.12	74.75
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	0		
12	607	Madison, WI	0		
12	676	Tomah, WI	81	84.68	193.70
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	138	130.15	220.71
15	589	Kansas City, MO	553	58.79	113.97
15	657	St. Louis, MO	120	22.98	47.54
16	502	Alexandria, LA	58	20.98	39.64
16	520	Biloxi, MS	72	72.18	170.90
16	580	Houston, TX	414	20.95	81.73
16	586	Jackson, MS	1	14.00	29.00
16	598	Little Rock, AR	437	20.55	82.03
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	2	9.00	33.50
16	667	Shreveport, LA	101	51.17	91.07
17	549	Dallas, TX	4	14.75	41.00
17	671	San Antonio, TX	135	10.19	75.24
17	674	Temple, TX	42	2.24	124.17
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	132	25.95	130.75
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	7	2.43	35.33
18	649	Prescott, AZ	111	3.84	61.28
18	678	Tucson, AZ	3	6.00	23.50
18	756	El Paso, TX	0		
19	554	Denver, Co	4	5.75	13.50
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	54	34.93	72.92
19	666	Sheridan, WY	0		
20	463	Anchorage, AK	24	5.00	28.73
20	531	Boise, ID	0		
20	648	Portland, OR	42	45.79	84.66
20	653	Roseburg, OR	14	10.00	44.57
20	663	Seattle, WA	179	6.20	151.78
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	0		
20	692	White City, OR	2	17.00	25.50
21	459	Honolulu, HI	25	56.24	158.57
21	612	Martinez, CA	0		
21	640	Palo Alto	17	1.41	19.86
21	654	Reno, NV	39	33.03	140.94
21	662	San Francisco, CA	0		

Appendix C.8 cont. Incentive Work Therapy (IT) Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of IT Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
22	593	Las Vegas, NV	3	2.00	15.33
22	600	Long Beach, CA	126	14.08	70.73
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	2	9.50	70.00
22	664	San Diego, CA	73	11.99	124.85
22	691	West LA, CA	50	81.42	247.00
23	437	Fargo, ND	0		
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	180	58.08	98.81
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	96	1.13	161.33
23	636	Des Moines, IA	82	84.77	168.67
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	150	44.19	139.57
All VA			**9,318**	**31.61**	**117.36**
Site Avg			**90**	**32.26**	**109.24**
Site SD			**135**	**33.23**	**70.81**

† Includes stop code 573 - group IT and 207 Rehabilitation Medicine Service IT.

Appendix C.9 Vocational Assistance Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of Vocational Assistance Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
1	402	Togus, ME	59	40.98	250.78
1	405	White River Junction, VT	1	2.00	1.00
1	518	Bedford, MA	34	1.91	132.13
1	523	Boston, MA	28	1.43	77.80
1	631	Northampton, MA	189	3.38	91.20
1	650	Providence, RI	44	3.66	60.25
1	689	West Haven, CT	375	9.20	112.47
2	528	Upstate NY HCS	1,651	5.29	97.51
3	526	Bronx, NY	10	9.90	71.33
3	561	E. Orange, NY	555	13.41	78.51
3	620	Montrose, NY	164	18.78	97.99
3	630	New York, NY	24	10.08	77.43
3	632	Northport, NY	259	4.55	105.90
4	529	Butler, PA	131	7.67	72.73
4	540	Clarksburg, WV	3	1.33	2.00
4	542	Coatesville, PA	103	3.01	58.82
4	595	Lebanon, PA	138	18.83	112.96
4	646	Pittsburgh, PA	173	6.83	45.53
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	74	6.53	53.14
5	512	Baltimore, MD	636	5.83	105.87
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	93	3.95	62.13
5	688	Washington DC	340	3.17	143.80
6	558	Durham, NC	118	1.38	92.67
6	590	Hampton, VA	384	17.70	95.61
6	652	Richmond, VA	105	9.68	129.85
6	658	Salem, VA	12	1.08	1.00
6	659	Salisbury, NC	41	3.29	57.07
7	508	Atlanta, GA	248	6.34	108.16
7	509	Augusta, GA	4	7.00	78.00
7	521	Birmingham, AL	1	2.00	9.00
7	534	Charleston, SC	78	2.22	68.77
7	544	Columbia, SC	349	2.74	34.67
7	557	Dublin, GA	210	4.55	76.22
7	619	Montgomery, AL	326	7.81	111.16
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	362	3.66	72.61
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	370	4.85	99.63
8	546	Miami, FL	57	13.58	107.98
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	269	3.14	76.46
8	573	Gainesville, FL	601	12.16	130.07
8	673	Tampa, FL	875	1.78	45.47
9	596	Lexington, KY	0		
9	614	Memphis, TN	373	2.32	90.87
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	4	3.50	26.33
9	626	Murfreesboro, TN	3	9.67	55.50

Appendix C.9 cont. Vocational Assistance Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of Vocational Assistance Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	251	5.47	87.42
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	166	1.54	75.98
10	541	Cleveland, OH	865	4.85	79.33
10	552	Dayton, OH	51	3.2	24.2
10	757	Columbus, OH	43	3.0	34.0
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	136	12.3	126.9
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	67	3.01	100.39
11	550	Danville, IL	186	6.69	126.36
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	329	5.60	94.80
11	610	Marion, IL	165	3.20	68.06
12	556	North Chicago, IL	303	2.83	52.68
12	578	Hines, IL	705	6.82	100.51
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	0		
12	607	Madison, WI	124	5.27	61.15
12	676	Tomah, WI	118	49.79	201.71
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	205	4.93	161.59
15	589	Kansas City, MO	731	2.70	62.86
15	657	St. Louis, MO	75	1.23	54.64
16	502	Alexandria, LA	238	2.32	135.83
16	520	Biloxi, MS	338	8.82	95.13
16	580	Houston, TX	634	11.26	124.01
16	586	Jackson, MS	3	7.00	104.00
16	598	Little Rock, AR	987	10.61	72.46
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	107	4.30	103.92
16	667	Shreveport, LA	207	13.60	94.81
17	549	Dallas, TX	282	2.22	41.90
17	671	San Antonio, TX	323	6.33	102.21
17	674	Temple, TX	417	8.09	79.60
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	333	3.24	114.51
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	459	1.58	60.33
18	649	Prescott, AZ	362	3.59	78.98
18	678	Tucson, AZ	18	2.89	14.25
18	756	El Paso, TX	0		
19	554	Denver, Co	2	15.50	24.50
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	300	3.44	110.33
19	666	Sheridan, WY	0		
20	463	Anchorage, AK	0		
20	531	Boise, ID	0		
20	648	Portland, OR	517	5.01	92.37
20	653	Roseburg, OR	113	8.22	114.86
20	663	Seattle, WA	255	2.93	76.57
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	72	28.49	121.20
20	692	White City, OR	75	42.91	103.68
21	459	Honolulu, HI	62	1.63	62.00
21	612	Martinez, CA	0		
21	640	Palo Alto	2	1.00	
21	654	Reno, NV	45	1.38	71.27
21	662	San Francisco, CA	81	1.62	57.94

Appendix C.9 cont. Vocational Assistance Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2004 by Site

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of Vocational Assistance Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop †
22	593	Las Vegas, NV	3	1.00	
22	600	Long Beach, CA	827	14.95	109.66
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	146	3.28	132.79
22	664	San Diego, CA	57	1.00	
22	691	West LA, CA	146	1.45	70.38
23	437	Fargo, ND	0		
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	15	13.80	36.93
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	5	4.00	60.00
23	636	Des Moines, IA	417	6.03	66.48
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	610	3.46	97.46
All VA			**22,852**	**6.85**	**92.57**
Site Avg			**232**	**7.28**	**85.18**
Site SD			**270**	**8.51**	**40.18**

† Includes stop codes 535 - individual Vocational Assistance, 575 - group Vocational Assistance and 213 Rehabilitation Medicine Service Vocational Assistance.

Appendix C.10 Type of Service Veterans Received First in the Psychosocial Rehabilitation Teatment Services Continuum of Care during FY 2004 by Site

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	% Received CWT &/or CWT/TR Services First	% Received IT Services First	% Received Vocational Assistance Services First
1	402	Togus, ME	94	13.8%	28.7%	58.5%
1	405	White River Junction, VT	91	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
1	518	Bedford, MA	747	94.8%	4.8%	1.3%
1	523	Boston, MA	339	56.6%	39.2%	4.7%
1	631	Northampton, MA	239	48.5%	9.2%	44.8%
1	650	Providence, RI	315	72.4%	23.2%	8.9%
1	689	West Haven, CT	420	6.4%	7.1%	86.7%
2	528	Upstate NY HCS	1,970	40.4%	7.2%	54.1%
3	526	Bronx, NY	414	96.6%	3.4%	0.0%
3	561	E. Orange, NY	684	32.5%	6.4%	64.5%
3	620	Montrose, NY	269	45.7%	21.2%	40.5%
3	630	New York, NY	403	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	632	Northport, NY	513	45.6%	22.2%	32.9%
4	529	Butler, PA	131	0.0%	0.8%	99.2%
4	540	Clarksburg, WV	3	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	235	62.6%	11.9%	29.4%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	175	37.1%	30.3%	62.3%
4	646	Pittsburgh, PA	409	40.3%	20.0%	40.1%
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	103	31.1%	0.0%	68.9%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	694	10.7%	15.7%	75.2%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	391	57.3%	35.5%	7.7%
5	688	Washington DC	386	51.0%	1.6%	52.3%
6	558	Durham, NC	159	0.0%	28.9%	71.1%
6	590	Hampton, VA	440	16.6%	31.1%	60.0%
6	652	Richmond, VA	105	2.9%	0.0%	97.1%
6	658	Salem, VA	167	58.7%	35.9%	5.4%
6	659	Salisbury, NC	94	1.1%	64.9%	34.0%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	371	80.9%	0.0%	22.1%
7	509	Augusta, GA	461	47.7%	52.3%	0.0%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	89	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	534	Charleston, SC	122	91.8%	0.0%	8.2%
7	544	Columbia, SC	451	59.9%	0.0%	53.0%
7	557	Dublin, GA	215	4.7%	15.8%	82.3%
7	619	Montgomery, AL	450	80.0%	0.0%	22.0%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	468	39.3%	7.9%	53.0%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	411	27.0%	11.2%	65.0%
8	546	Miami, FL	296	57.1%	35.1%	12.8%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	275	6.5%	0.0%	93.8%
8	573	Gainesville, FL	628	7.2%	0.0%	93.2%
8	673	Tampa, FL	951	8.2%	2.3%	89.5%
9	596	Lexington, KY	6	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	412	12.9%	1.0%	86.7%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	535	9.9%	90.7%	0.0%
9	626	Murfreesboro, TN	180	98.3%	1.7%	0.0%

Appendix C.10 cont. Type of Service Veterans Received First in the Psychosocial Rehabilitation Teatment Services Continuum of Care during FY 2004 by Site

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	% Received CWT &/or CWT/TR Services First	% Received IT Services First	% Received Vocational Assistance Services First
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	988	88.7%	3.2%	9.1%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	400	81.5%	3.3%	17.3%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	1,974	77.4%	2.0%	21.9%
10	552	Dayton, OH	585	12.3%	84.3%	4.3%
10	757	Columbus, OH	95	74.7%	0.0%	25.3%
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	145	21.4%	0.0%	80.7%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	680	89.4%	9.4%	2.5%
11	550	Danville, IL	190	11.6%	9.5%	85.8%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	334	11.7%	10.5%	79.0%
11	610	Marion, IL	280	38.2%	2.9%	58.9%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	511	40.5%	65.2%	33.1%
12	578	Hines, IL	784	44.4%	0.0%	59.4%
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	10	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12	607	Madison, WI	191	42.9%	0.0%	58.1%
12	676	Tomah, WI	256	47.7%	21.9%	30.5%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	299	36.8%	35.8%	31.4%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	1,423	39.4%	23.5%	37.9%
15	657	St. Louis, MO	203	8.9%	56.2%	35.0%
16	502	Alexandria, LA	269	0.0%	18.6%	81.4%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	350	19.7%	10.3%	80.9%
16	580	Houston, TX	683	12.9%	15.2%	73.1%
16	586	Jackson, MS	222	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	1,204	4.9%	28.4%	67.6%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	119	26.1%	0.0%	75.6%
16	667	Shreveport, LA	238	13.9%	14.3%	84.5%
17	549	Dallas, TX	1,266	86.3%	0.0%	14.0%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	351	6.3%	20.8%	81.5%
17	674	Temple, TX	463	8.2%	7.8%	84.2%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	526	58.6%	8.4%	35.0%
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	545	21.7%	0.0%	78.7%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	558	66.7%	3.9%	30.5%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	167	92.2%	0.0%	7.8%
18	756	El Paso, TX	11	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
19	554	Denver, Co	307	99.3%	0.7%	0.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	308	6.2%	4.9%	90.3%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	7	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	85	71.8%	28.2%	0.0%
20	531	Boise, ID	4	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
20	648	Portland, OR	545	9.9%	1.3%	89.4%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	124	21.8%	2.4%	80.6%
20	663	Seattle, WA	415	16.4%	35.7%	48.4%
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	92	29.3%	0.0%	73.9%
20	692	White City, OR	97	29.9%	0.0%	70.1%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	86	24.4%	10.5%	67.4%
21	612	Martinez, CA	204	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21	640	Palo Alto	169	90.5%	9.5%	0.0%
21	654	Reno, NV	99	44.4%	24.2%	33.3%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	243	83.5%	0.0%	16.5%

Appendix C.10 cont. Type of Service Veterans Received First in the Psychosocial Rehabilitation Teatment Services Continuum of Care during FY 2004 by Site

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	% Received CWT &/or CWT/TR Services First	% Received IT Services First	% Received Vocational Assistance Services First
22	593	Las Vegas, NV	89	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	970	35.8%	1.9%	70.0%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	288	93.4%	0.0%	7.6%
22	664	San Diego, CA	138	13.0%	52.2%	34.8%
22	691	West LA, CA	589	74.9%	5.8%	21.7%
23	437	Fargo, ND	23	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
23	568	Fort Meade, SD	763	94.1%	7.2%	0.5%
23	618	Minneapolis, MN	124	22.6%	76.6%	0.8%
23	636	Des Moines, IA	529	14.0%	13.4%	74.3%
23	656	St. Cloud, MN	775	47.2%	4.9%	52.8%
All VA			**39,704**	**45.9%**	**13.6%**	**43.0%**
Site Avg			**389**	**47.7%**	**13.7%**	**41.0%**
Site SD			**359**	**34.4%**	**19.5%**	**33.3%**

Appendix D: National Staffing Report Tables for the First Half of FY 2005

List of National Staffing Report Tables

Appendix D.1a Time-Adjusted VA FTEE and Contract Hours: CWT Programs, First Half FY 2005, by VISN

Appendix D.1b Filled VA FTEE and Filled Contract Hours: CWT Programs, First Half FY 2005, by VISN

Appendix D.2a Time-Adjusted VA FTEE and Contract Hours: CWT Programs, First Half FY 2005, by Station

Appendix D.2b Filled VA FTEE and Filled Contract Hours: CWT Programs, First Half FY 2005, by Station

Appendix D.3 Expenditures (Personnel Dollars): CWT Programs: First Half FY 2005, by VISN

Appendix D.4 Expenditures (Personnel Dollars): CWT Programs, First Half FY 2005, by Station

Appendix D.5 Hours Worked by Specific Activity: CWT Programs, First Half FY 2005, by Station

Appendix D.6a Total Hours Worked: CWT Programs, First Half FY 2005, by VISN

Appendix D.6b Total Hours Worked: CWT Programs, First Half FY 2005, by Station

Appendix D.1a Time-Adjusted VA FTEE and Contract Hours: CWT Programs, First Half FY 2005, by VISN

VISN	TIME-ADJUSTED VA FTEE †	CONTRACT HOURS
1	26.48	80
2	16.06	40
3	19.85	120
4	26.63	80
5	13.91	0
6	10.59	0
7	25.40	80
8	12.26	0
9	11.30	0
10	23.49	0
11	11.53	160
12	22.80	80
15	7.28	0
16	16.58	200
17	38.87	0
18	5.23	0
19	4.20	0
20	17.12	40
21	13.79	40
22	23.78	40
23	29.79	40
TOTAL HOURS	**376.95**	**1000**
AVERAGE	**17.95**	**48**
SD	**8.80**	**57**
CV	**0.49**	**1.21**

† Time-Adjusted VA FTEE and contract hours include all VA staff working with the program, and are calculated by multiplying the number of hours worked per week by the length of time worked during the first half of FY05.

**Appendix D.1b Filled VA FTEE and Filled Contract Hours:
CWT Programs, First Half FY 2005, by VISN†**

VISN	FILLED VA FTEE	FILLED CONTRACT HOURS
1	27.28	70
2	15.80	40
3	20.25	112
4	26.35	80
5	13.15	0
6	10.50	0
7	24.70	70
8	12.73	0
9	12.28	0
10	24.18	0
11	12.08	85
12	24.88	80
15	7.65	0
16	16.88	200
17	40.38	0
18	5.30	0
19	4.23	0
20	17.40	40
21	13.00	20
22	23.75	40
23	28.48	40
TOTAL FILLED HOURS	**381.20**	**877**
AVERAGE	**18.15**	**42**
SD	**8.94**	**51**
CV	**0.49**	**1.23**

†Filled FTEE and filled contract hours include only staff occupying a
position at the end of the first half of the FY, and are based on their actual
number of hours worked during the week.

Appendix D.2a Time-Adjusted VA FTEE and Contract Hours: Compensated Work Therapy Programs, First Half FY05, by Station†

VISN	STATION	STATION CODE	TIME-ADJUSTED VA FTEE	CONTRACT HOURS
1	BEDFORD, MA	518	9.40	0
1	BOSTON (MA) HCS: Boston	523	1.69	0
1	BOSTON (MA) HCS: Brockton	523A5	3.28	0
1	CONNECTICUT HCS: West Haven	689	4.26	80
1	NORTHAMPTON,(Leeds) MA	631	4.09	0
1	PROVIDENCE, RI	650	2.96	0
1	WHITE RIVER JUNCTION, VT	405	0.80	0
2	ALBANY, NY	528A8	5.67	0
2	BATH, NY	528A6	2.04	0
2	CANANDAIGUA, NY	528A5	2.11	0
2	ROCHESTER, NY	528GE	0.35	0
2	SYRACUSE, NY	528A7	1.74	40
2	WESTERN NY HCS: Batavia	528A4	0.30	0
2	WESTERN NY HCS: Buffalo	528	3.85	0
3	BRONX, NY	526	1.99	40
3	HUDSON VALLEY (NY) HCS: Montrose	620	3.48	0
3	NEW JERSEY HCS: East Orange	561	1.97	0
3	NEW JERSEY HCS: Lyons	561A4	3.98	0
3	NEW YORK HARBOR HCS: Brooklyn	630A4	2.28	0
3	NORTHPORT, NY	632	6.14	80
4	BUTLER,PA	529	0.82	0
4	COATESVILLE, PA	542	13.00	0
4	LEBANON, PA	595	6.59	80
4	PITTSBURGH (PA) HCS	646A5	5.22	0
4	WILKES-BARRE, PA	693	0.99	0
5	MARTINSBURG, WV	613	3.72	0
5	MARYLAND HCS	512	2.24	0
5	MARYLAND HCS: Perry Point	512A5	2.49	0
5	WASHINGTON, DC	688	5.47	0
6	ASHEVILLE, NC	637	0.99	0
6	HAMPTON, VA	590	5.62	0
6	RICHMOND, VA	652	0.99	0
6	SALEM, VA	658	2.98	0
7	ATLANTA, GA	508	3.98	0
7	AUGUSTA, GA	509	3.53	80
7	BIRMINGHAM, AL	521	0.99	0
7	CENTRAL AL VETERANS HCS: Tuskegee	619A4	6.96	0
7	CHARLESTON, SC	534	0.99	0
7	COLUMBIA, SC	544	2.98	0
7	DUBLIN, GA	557	0.55	0
7	TUSCALOOSA, AL+B19	679	5.41	0
8	BAY PINES, FL	516	2.98	0
8	MIAMI, FL	546	0.02	0
8	NO.FL/SO.GA VETERANS HCS: Gainesville	573	1.19	0
8	ORLANDO, FL	673OR	0.99	0
8	TAMPA, FL	673	5.08	0
8	WEST PALM BEACH, FL	548	1.99	0
9	LEXINGTON, KY	596	1.09	0
9	LOUISVILLE, KY	603	2.87	0
9	MEMPHIS, TN	614	1.37	0
9	MIDDLE TN HCS: Murfreesboro	626A4	0.99	0
9	MOUNTAIN HOME, TN	621	4.97	0

Appendix D.2a Time-Adjusted VA FTEE and Contract Hours: Compensated Work Therapy Programs, First Half FY05, by Station†

VISN	STATION	STATION CODE	TIME-ADJUSTED VA FTEE	CONTRACT HOURS
10	CHILLICOTHE, OH	538	7.83	0
10	CINCINNATI, OH	539	3.03	0
10	CLEVELAND, OH	541	11.19	0
10	COLUMBUS, OH	757	1.02	0
10	DAYTON, OH	552	0.42	0
11	ANN ARBOR (MI) HCS	506	3.98	120
11	BATTLE CREEK, MI	515	2.73	0
11	DANVILLE, IL	550	1.62	0
11	INDIANAPOLIS, IN	583	1.69	40
11	NORTHERN IN HCS: Marion	610	1.51	0
12	HINES, IL	578	6.11	0
12	MADISON, WI	607	2.51	0
12	MILWAUKEE, WI	695	6.71	80
12	NORTH CHICAGO, IL	556	2.64	0
12	TOMAH, WI	676	4.82	0
15	COLUMBIA, MO	589A4	0.67	0
15	EASTERN KANSAS HCS: Leavenworth	589A6	0.99	0
15	EASTERN KANSAS HCS: Topeka	589A5	1.99	0
15	KANSAS CITY, MO	589	2.49	0
15	POPLAR BLUFF, MO	657A4	0.15	0
15	ST. LOUIS (MO): Jefferson Barracks	657A0	0.99	0
16	CENTRAL AR VET. HCS: Little Rock	598	2.73	0
16	GULF COAST (MS) VET. HCS: Biloxi	520	5.48	0
16	HOUSTON, TX	580	3.18	0
16	JACKSON, MS	586	1.45	0
16	OKLAHOMA CITY, OK	635	3.73	200
17	CENTRAL TX VETERANS HCS: Temple	674	8.70	0
17	FORT WORTH, TX	549BY	1.99	0
17	NORTH TX HCS: Bonham	549A4	11.93	0
17	NORTH TX HCS: Dallas	549	6.15	0
17	NORTH TX HCS: Dallas-downtown	549DT	5.97	0
17	SOUTH TX VETERANS HCS: San Antonio	671	4.13	0
18	EL PASO VA HCS	756	0.15	0
18	NEW MEXICO HCS: Albuquerque	501	1.60	0
18	NORTHERN ARIZONA HCS: Prescott	649	1.49	0
18	SOUTHERN AZ HCS (Tucson)	678	1.99	0
19	SALT LAKE CITY (UT) HCS	660	1.99	0
19	SHERIDAN, WY	666	1.84	0
19	SO. COLORADO HCS: Colorado Springs	567GB	0.37	0
20	ALASKA VA HCS: Anchorage	463	5.07	0
20	PORTLAND, OR	648	1.77	0
20	PUGET SOUND (WA) HCS: Tacoma	663A4	3.28	0
20	ROSEBURG (OR) HCS	653	1.06	0
20	ROSEBURG (OR) HCS: Eugene	653BY	0.60	0
20	WALLA WALLA, WA	687	0.99	0
20	WHITE CITY, OR	692	4.35	40
21	HONOLULU, HI	459	1.39	0
21	PALO ALTO (CA) HCS	640	6.96	40
21	SAN FRANCISCO (CA) Domiciliary	662BU	5.07	0
21	SIERRA NEVADA HCS: Reno	654	0.36	0
22	GREATER LOS ANGELES (CA) HCS	691	13.84	0
22	GREATER LOS ANGELES (CA) HCS: Sepul	691A4	3.56	40
22	LOMA LINDA, CA	605	2.78	0
22	LONG BEACH (CA) HCS	600	1.64	0
22	SAN DIEGO (CA) HCS	664	1.96	0

Appendix D.2a Time-Adjusted VA FTEE and Contract Hours: Compensated Work Therapy Programs, First Half FY05, by Station†

VISN	STATION	STATION CODE	TIME-ADJUSTED VA FTEE	CONTRACT HOURS
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: Eagle Butte	568HM	0.99	0
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: Fort Meade	568	4.19	0
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: Hot Springs	568A4	5.53	0
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: McLaughlin	568HK	2.98	0
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: Pine Ridge	568HF	4.97	0
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: Rapid City	568GA	0.99	0
23	CENTRAL IA HCS: Knoxville	636A7	1.42	0
23	FARGO, ND	437	0.50	40
23	MINNEAPOLIS, MN	618	3.13	0
23	NE-WESTERN IA HCS: Omaha	636	0.20	0
23	ST. CLOUD, MN	656	4.87	0
TOTAL			**376.94**	**1000**
AVERAGE			**3.19**	**8**
SD			**2.68**	**28**
CV			**0.84**	**3.26**

† Time-Adjusted FTEE hours and contract hours include all staff working with the program, during the first half of the FY.

Appendix D.2b Filled VA FTEE and Filled Contract Hours: CWT Programs, First Half FY 2005, by Station

VISN	STATION	STATION CODE	† FILLED VA FTEE	FILLED CONTRACT HOURS
1	BEDFORD, MA	518	10.00	0
1	BOSTON (MA) HCS: Boston	523	1.70	0
1	BOSTON (MA) HCS: Brockton	523A5	3.30	0
1	CONNECTICUT HCS: West Haven	689	5.00	70
1	NORTHAMPTON,(Leeds) MA	631	3.50	0
1	PROVIDENCE, RI	650	2.98	0
1	WHITE RIVER JUNCTION, VT	405	0.80	0
2	ALBANY, NY	528A8	5.70	0
2	BATH, NY	528A6	2.05	0
2	CANANDAIGUA, NY	528A5	2.13	0
2	CANANDAIGUA/Rochester OPC, NY	528GE	0.00	0
2	SYRACUSE, NY	528A7	1.75	40
2	WESTERN NY HCS: Batavia	528A4	0.30	0
2	WESTERN NY HCS: Buffalo	528	3.88	0
3	BRONX, NY	526	2.00	32
3	HUDSON VALLEY (NY) HCS: Montrose	620	3.50	0
3	NEW JERSEY HCS: East Orange	561	2.00	0
3	NEW JERSEY HCS: Lyons	561A4	4.00	0
3	NEW YORK HARBOR HCS: Brooklyn	630A4	2.40	0
3	NORTHPORT, NY	632	6.35	80
4	BUTLER,PA	529	0.83	0
4	COATESVILLE, PA	542	12.65	0
4	LEBANON, PA	595	6.63	80
4	PITTSBURGH (PA) HCS	646A5	5.25	0
4	WILKES-BARRE, PA	693	1.00	0
5	MARTINSBURG, WV	613	2.90	0
5	MARYLAND HCS: Baltimore	512	2.25	0
5	MARYLAND HCS: Perry Point	512A5	2.50	0
5	WASHINGTON, DC	688	5.50	0
6	ASHEVILLE, NC	637	1.00	0
6	HAMPTON, VA	590	5.50	0
6	RICHMOND, VA	652	1.00	0
6	SALEM, VA	658	3.00	0
7	ATLANTA, GA	508	4.00	0
7	AUGUSTA (Downtown), GA	509	3.55	70
7	BIRMINGHAM, AL	521	1.00	0
7	CENTRAL AL VETERANS HCS: Tuskegee	619A4	7.00	0
7	CHARLESTON, SC	534	1.00	0
7	COLUMBIA, SC	544	3.00	0
7	DUBLIN, GA	557	0.55	0
7	TUSCALOOSA, AL	679	4.60	0
8	BAY PINES, FL	516	3.00	0
8	MIAMI, FL	546	0.03	0
8	NO.FL/SO.GA VETERANS HCS: Gainesville	573	1.20	0
8	ORLANDO, FL	673OR	1.00	0
8	TAMPA, FL	673	5.50	0
8	WEST PALM BEACH, FL	548	2.00	0
9	LEXINGTON, KY	596	1.10	0
9	LOUISVILLE, KY	603	3.80	0
9	MEMPHIS, TN	614	1.38	0
9	MIDDLE TN HCS: Murfreesboro	626A4	1.00	0
9	MOUNTAIN HOME, TN	621	5.00	0

Appendix D.2b Filled VA FTEE and Filled Contract Hours: CWT Programs, First Half FY 2005, by Station

VISN	STATION	STATION CODE	† FILLED VA FTEE	FILLED CONTRACT HOURS
10	CHILLICOTHE, OH	538	7.88	0
10	CINCINNATI, OH	539	3.05	0
10	CLEVELAND, OH	541	11.80	0
10	COLUMBUS, OH	757	1.03	0
10	DAYTON, OH	552	0.43	0
11	ANN ARBOR (MI) HCS	506	4.00	69
11	BATTLE CREEK, MI	515	2.75	0
11	ILLIANA (IL) HCS: Danville	550	1.63	0
11	INDIANAPOLIS, IN	583	1.70	16
11	NORTHERN IN HCS: Marion	610	2.00	0
12	HINES, IL	578	8.00	0
12	MADISON, WI	607	2.88	0
12	MILWAUKEE, WI	695	6.75	80
12	NORTH CHICAGO, IL	556	2.50	0
12	TOMAH, WI	676	4.75	0
15	COLUMBIA, MO	589A4	1.00	0
15	EASTERN KANSAS HCS: Leavenworth	589A6	1.00	0
15	EASTERN KANSAS HCS: Topeka	589A5	2.00	0
15	KANSAS CITY, MO	589	2.50	0
15	POPLAR BLUFF, MO	657A4	0.15	0
15	ST. LOUIS (MO): Jefferson Barracks	657A0	1.00	0
16	CENTRAL AR VET. HCS: Little Rock	598	2.75	0
16	GULF COAST (MS) VET. HCS: Biloxi	520	5.68	0
16	HOUSTON, TX	580	3.20	0
16	JACKSON, MS	586	1.50	0
16	OKLAHOMA CITY, OK	635	3.75	200
17	CENTRAL TX VETERANS HCS: Temple	674	8.75	0
17	NORTH TX HCS: Bonham	549A4	2.00	0
17	NORTH TX HCS: Dallas	549	12.00	0
17	NORTH TX HCS: Dallas (Downtown)	549DT	7.00	0
17	NORTH TX HCS: Fort Worth	549BY	6.00	0
17	SOUTH TX VETERANS HCS: San Antonio	671	4.63	0
18	EL PASO VA HCS	756	0.15	0
18	NEW MEXICO HCS: Albuquerque	501	1.65	0
18	NORTHERN ARIZONA HCS: Prescott	649	1.50	0
18	SOUTHERN AZ HCS (Tucson)	678	2.00	0
19	EASTERN COLORADO HCS: Colorado Springs	567GB	2.00	0
19	SALT LAKE CITY (UT) HCS	660	1.85	0
19	SHERIDAN, WY	666	0.38	0
20	ALASKA VA HCS: Anchorage	463	5.10	0
20	PORTLAND, OR	648	1.78	0
20	PUGET SOUND (WA) HCS: American Lake	663A4	3.65	0
20	ROSEBURG (OR) HCS	653	0.90	0
20	ROSEBURG (OR) HCS: Eugene	653BY	0.60	0
20	WALLA WALLA, WA	687	1.00	0
20	WHITE CITY, OR	692	4.38	40
21	HONOLULU, HI	459	1.40	0
21	PALO ALTO (CA) HCS	640	7.00	20
21	SAN FRANCISCO (CA) Domiciliary	662BU	4.60	0
21	SIERRA NEVADA HCS: Reno	654	0.00	0

Appendix D.2b Filled VA FTEE and Filled Contract Hours: CWT Programs, First Half FY 2005, by Station

VISN	STATION	STATION CODE	† FILLED VA FTEE	FILLED CONTRACT HOURS
22	GREATER LA (CA) HCS	691	13.75	0
22	GREATER LA (CA) HCS: Sepulveda	691A4	3.58	40
22	LOMA LINDA, CA	605	2.80	0
22	LONG BEACH (CA) HCS	600	1.65	0
22	SAN DIEGO (CA) HCS	664	1.98	0
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: Eagle Butte	568HM	1.00	0
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: Fort Meade	568	3.30	0
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: Hot Springs	568A4	5.00	0
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: McLaughlin	568HK	3.00	0
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: Pine Ridge	568HF	5.00	0
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: Rapid City	568GA	1.00	0
23	CENTRAL IA HCS: Knoxville	636A7	1.43	0
23	FARGO, ND	437	0.50	40
23	MINNEAPOLIS, MN	618	3.15	0
23	NE-WESTERN IA HCS: Omaha	636	0.20	0
23	ST. CLOUD, MN	656	4.90	0
TOTAL			**381.30**	**877**
AVERAGE			**3.23**	**7**
SD			**2.73**	**25**
CV			**0.85**	**3.41**

† Filled VA FTEE and filled contract hours include only staff occupying a position at the end of the first half of the FY, and are based on the actual number of hours worked during the week.

Appendix D.3 Expenditures (Personnel Dollars): CWT Programs, First Half FY 2005, by VISN

VISN	Total Direct Expenditures	Program Support Expenditures	Program Support Expenditures per Total Expenditures (%)
1	$1,082,898	$56,584	5.23%
2	$522,294	$10,400	1.99%
3	$803,078	$31,491	3.92%
4	$863,411	$2,027	0.23%
5	$560,725	$0	0.00%
6	$401,306	$0	0.00%
7	$854,158	$25,851	3.03%
8	$419,060	$0	0.00%
9	$373,583	$0	0.00%
10	$800,521	$0	0.00%
11	$449,318	$32,109	7.15%
12	$857,681	$47,606	5.55%
15	$266,328	$0	0.00%
16	$608,923	$18,058	2.97%
17	$1,362,470	$0	0.00%
18	$184,843	$0	0.00%
19	$149,040	$0	0.00%
20	$621,640	$10,014	1.61%
21	$611,936	$12,258	2.00%
22	$996,182	$24,258	2.44%
23	$917,746	$400	0.04%
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	**$13,707,138**	**$271,056**	**1.98%**
AVERAGE	**$652,721**	**$12,907**	**1.72%**
SD	**$311,244**	**$17,231**	**2.20%**
CV	**0.48**	**1.33**	**1.28**

Appendix D.4 Expenditures (Personnel Dollars): CWT Program, First Half FY 2005, by Station

VISN	STATION	STATION CODE	TOTAL DIRECT EXPENDITURES †	PROGRAM SUPPORT EXPENDITURES †	PROGRAM SUPPORT EXPENDITURES PER TOTAL EXPENDITURES(%)
1	BEDFORD, MA	518	$375,746	$0	0.00%
1	BOSTON (MA) HCS: Boston	523	------	$0	------
1	BOSTON (MA) HCS: Brockton	523A5	$123,554	$0	0.00%
1	CONNECTICUT HCS: West Haven	689	$229,144	$56,584	24.69%
1	NORTHAMPTON, (Leeds) MA	631	$154,208	$0	0.00%
1	PROVIDENCE, RI	650	------	$0	------
1	WHITE RIVER JUNCTION, VT	405	------	$0	------
2	ALBANY, NY	528A8	$187,693	$0	0.00%
2	BATH, NY	528A6	------	$0	------
2	CANANDAIGUA, NY	528A5	------	$0	------
2	ROCHESTER, NY	528GE	------	$0	------
2	SYRACUSE, NY	528A7	------	$10,400	------
2	WESTERN NY HCS: Batavia	528A4	------	$0	------
2	WESTERN NY HCS: Buffalo	528	$130,803	$0	0.00%
3	BRONX, NY	526	------	$6,390	------
3	HUDSON VALLEY (NY) HCS: Montrose	620	$111,103	$0	0.00%
3	NEW JERSEY HCS: East Orange	561	------	$0	------
3	NEW JERSEY HCS: Lyons	561A4	$158,121	$0	0.00%
3	NEW YORK HARBOR HCS: Brooklyn	630A4	------	$0	------
3	NORTHPORT, NY	632	$251,844	$25,101	9.97%
4	BUTLER, PA	529	------	$0	------
4	COATESVILLE, PA	542	$426,394	$0	0.00%
4	LEBANON, PA	595	$188,890	$2,027	1.07%
4	PITTSBURGH (PA) HCS	646A5	$190,646	$0	0.00%
4	WILKES-BARRE, PA	693	------	$0	------
5	MARTINSBURG, WV	613	$131,558	$0	0.00%
5	MARYLAND HCS	512	------	$0	------
5	MARYLAND HCS: Perry Point	512A5	------	$0	------
5	WASHINGTON, DC	688	$225,797	$0	0.00%
6	ASHEVILLE, NC	637	------	$0	------
6	HAMPTON, VA	590	$219,418	$0	0.00%
6	RICHMOND, VA	652	------	$0	------
6	SALEM, VA	658	------	$0	------
7	ATLANTA, GA	508	$126,858	$0	0.00%
7	AUGUSTA, GA	509	$144,254	$25,851	17.92%
7	BIRMINGHAM, AL	521	------	$0	------
7	CENTRAL AL VETERANS HCS: Tuskegee	619A4	$230,686	$0	0.00%
7	CHARLESTON, SC	534	------	$0	------
7	COLUMBIA, SC	544	------	$0	------
7	DUBLIN, GA	557	------	$0	------
7	TUSCALOOSA, AL	679	$158,780	$0	0.00%
8	BAY PINES, FL	516	------	$0	------
8	MIAMI, FL	546	------	$0	------
8	NO.FL/SO.GA VETERANS HCS: Gainesville	573	------	$0	------
8	ORLANDO, FL	673OR	------	$0	------
8	TAMPA, FL	673	$163,770	$0	0.00%
8	WEST PALM BEACH, FL	548	$67,799	$0	0.00%

Appendix D.4 Expenditures (Personnel Dollars): CWT Program, First Half FY 2005, by Station

VISN	STATION	STATION CODE	TOTAL DIRECT EXPENDITURES †	PROGRAM SUPPORT EXPENDITURES †	PROGRAM SUPPORT EXPENDITURES PER TOTAL EXPENDITURES(%)
9	LEXINGTON, KY	596	------	$0	------
9	LOUISVILLE, KY	603	------	$0	------
9	MEMPHIS, TN	614	------	$0	------
9	MIDDLE TN HCS: Murfreesboro	626A4	------	$0	------
9	MOUNTAIN HOME, TN	621	$164,898	$0	0.00%
10	CHILLICOTHE, OH	538	$257,539	$0	0.00%
10	CINCINNATI, OH	539	$106,081	$0	0.00%
10	CLEVELAND, OH	541	$388,305	$0	0.00%
10	COLUMBUS, OH	757	------	$0	------
10	DAYTON, OH	552	------	$0	------
11	ANN ARBOR (MI) HCS	506	$184,969	$24,171	13.07%
11	BATTLE CREEK, MI	515	------	$0	------
11	DANVILLE, IL	550	------	$0	------
11	INDIANAPOLIS, IN	583	------	$7,938	------
11	NORTHERN IN HCS: Marion	610	------	$0	------
12	HINES, IL	578	$229,021	$0	0.00%
12	MADISON, WI	607	------	$0	------
12	MILWAUKEE, WI	695	$295,448	$47,606	16.11%
12	NORTH CHICAGO, IL	556	------	$0	------
12	TOMAH, WI	676	$167,213	$0	0.00%
15	COLUMBIA, MO	589A4	------	$0	------
15	EASTERN KANSAS HCS: Leavenworth	589A6	------	$0	------
15	EASTERN KANSAS HCS: Topeka	589A5	------	$0	------
15	KANSAS CITY, MO	589	------	$0	------
15	POPLAR BLUFF, MO	657A4	------	$0	------
15	ST. LOUIS (MO): Jefferson Barracks	657A0	------	$0	------
16	CENTRAL AR VET. HCS: Little Rock	598	------	$0	------
16	GULF COAST (MS) VET. HCS: Biloxi	520	$190,386	$0	0.00%
16	HOUSTON, TX	580	$146,763	$0	0.00%
16	JACKSON, MS	586	------	$0	------
16	OKLAHOMA CITY, OK	635	$131,188	$18,058	13.76%
17	CENTRAL TX VETERANS HCS: Temple	674	$307,383	$0	0.00%
17	FORT WORTH, TX	549BY	$210,692	$0	0.00%
17	NORTH TX HCS: Bonham	549A4	------	$0	------
17	NORTH TX HCS: Dallas	549	$387,122	$0	0.00%
17	NORTH TX HCS: Dallas-downtown	549DT	$165,103	$0	0.00%
17	SOUTH TX VETERANS HCS: San Antonio	671	$237,095	$0	0.00%
18	EL PASO VA HCS	756	------	$0	------
18	NEW MEXICO HCS: Albuquerque	501	------	$0	------
18	NORTHERN ARIZONA HCS: Prescott	649	------	$0	------
18	SOUTHERN AZ HCS (Tucson)	678	------	$0	------
19	SALT LAKE CITY (UT) HCS	660	------	$0	------
19	SHERIDAN, WY	666	------	$0	------
19	SO. COLORADO HCS: Colorado Springs	567GB	------	$0	------

Appendix D.4 Expenditures (Personnel Dollars): CWT Program, First Half FY 2005, by Station

VISN	STATION	STATION CODE	TOTAL DIRECT EXPENDITURES †	PROGRAM SUPPORT EXPENDITURES †	PROGRAM SUPPORT EXPENDITURES PER TOTAL EXPENDITURES(%)
20	ALASKA VA HCS: Anchorage	463	$208,293	$0	0.00%
20	PORTLAND, OR	648	------	$0	------
20	PUGET SOUND (WA) HCS: Tacoma	663A4	$127,647	$0	0.00%
20	ROSEBURG (OR) HCS	653	------	$0	------
20	ROSEBURG (OR) HCS: Eugene	653BY	------	$0	------
20	WALLA WALLA, WA	687	------	$0	------
20	WHITE CITY, OR	692	$140,784	$10,014	7.11%
21	HONOLULU, HI	459	------	$0	------
21	PALO ALTO (CA) HCS	640	$348,527	$12,258	3.52%
21	SAN FRANCISCO (CA) Domiciliary	662BU	$198,051	$0	0.00%
21	SIERRA NEVADA HCS: Reno	654	------	$0	------
22	GREATER LOS ANGELES (CA) HCS	691	$594,770	$0	0.00%
22	GREATER LOS ANGELES (CA) HCS: Sepulveda	691A4	$135,176	$24,258	17.95%
22	LOMA LINDA, CA	605	------	$0	------
22	LONG BEACH (CA) HCS	600	------	$0	------
22	SAN DIEGO (CA) HCS	664	------	$0	------
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: Eagle Butte	568HM	------	$0	------
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: Fort Meade	568	$149,087	$0	0.00%
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: Hot Springs	568A4	$179,533	$0	0.00%
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: McLaughlin	568HK	------	$0	------
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: Pine Ridge	568HF	$115,784	$0	0.00%
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: Rapid City	568GA	------	$0	------
23	CENTRAL IA HCS: Knoxville	636A7	------	$0	------
23	FARGO, ND	437	------	$400	------
23	MINNEAPOLIS, MN	618	$108,729	$0	0.00%
23	NE-WESTERN IA HCS: Omaha	636	------	$0	------
23	ST. CLOUD, MN	656	$148,774	$0	0.00%
	TOTAL PROGRAM SUPPORT EXPENDITURES††		$13,707,138	$271,056	1.98%
	AVERAGE		$116,162	$2,297	1.41%
	SD		$101,302	$8,325	4.41%
	CV		0.87	3.62	3.13

† Expenditures are not shown for sites with fewer than three staff in order to preserve confidentiality.

††Total expenditures shown includes expenditures for all sites.

Appendix D.5 Hours Worked by Specific Activity: CWT Programs, First Half FY 2005, by Station

VISN	STATION	STATION CODE	SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT	TRANSITIONAL EMPLOYMENT	WORKSHOP OR JOB READINESS	ADMINISTRATIVE, EDUCATIONAL OR SUPERVISORY	OTHER ACTIVITIES	TOTAL HOURS OF INDIVIDUAL ACTIVITIES
1	BEDFORD, MA	518	35	111	2	201	0	349
1	BOSTON (MA) HCS: Boston	523	0	52	0	16	0	68
1	BOSTON (MA) HCS: Brockton	523A5	0	124	0	8	0	132
1	CONNECTICUT HCS: West Haven	689	140	35	3	84	0	262
1	NORTHAMPTON,(Leeds) MA	631	1	45	33	53	0	132
1	PROVIDENCE, RI	650	14	17	3	22	8	64
1	WHITE RIVER JUNCTION, VT	405	0	16	0	16	0	32
2	ALBANY, NY	528A8	0	60	0	83	0	143
2	BATH, NY	528A6	0	15	5	32	10	62
2	CANANDAIGUA, NY	528A5	0	40	0	30	15	85
2	ROCHESTER, NY	528GE	0	5	25	10	0	40
2	SYRACUSE, NY	528A7	0	42	0	28	40	110
2	WESTERN NY HCS: Batavia	528A4	0	10	0	2	0	12
2	WESTERN NY HCS: Buffalo	528	48	54	1	29	8	140
3	BRONX, NY	526	16	42	0	22	32	112
3	HUDSON VALLEY (NY) HCS: Montrose	620	35	35	0	14	56	140
3	NEW JERSEY HCS: East Orange	561	0	70	0	50	0	120
3	NEW JERSEY HCS: Lyons	561A4	0	120	0	40	0	160
3	NEW YORK HARBOR HCS: Brooklyn	630A4	24	56	1	18	0	99
3	NORTHPORT, NY	632	0	108	0	54	80	242
4	BUTLER,PA	529	4	10	0	13	6	33
4	COATESVILLE, PA	542	58	152	0	224	4	438
4	LEBANON, PA	595	0	97	38	70	0	205
4	PITTSBURGH (PA) HCS	646A5	20	45	0	50	40	155
4	WILKES-BARRE, PA	693	0	5	0	35	0	40
5	MARTINSBURG, WV	613	0	78	0	114	4	196
5	MARYLAND HCS	512	15	30	10	15	0	70
5	MARYLAND HCS: Perry Point	512A5	10	25	0	30	0	65
5	WASHINGTON, DC	688	0	85	0	110	0	195
6	ASHEVILLE, NC	637	0	30	5	5	0	40
6	HAMPTON, VA	590	0	90	30	63	5	188
6	RICHMOND, VA	652	0	20	5	15	0	40
6	SALEM, VA	658	25	25	5	35	0	90
7	ATLANTA, GA	508	0	70	0	45	0	115
7	AUGUSTA, GA	509	20	50	0	42	70	182
7	BIRMINGHAM, AL	521	0	30	0	10	0	40
7	CENTRAL AL VETERANS HCS: Tuskegee	619A4	0	145	0	70	65	280
7	CHARLESTON, SC	534	8	20	6	6	0	40
7	COLUMBIA, SC	544	10	25	0	45	0	80
7	DUBLIN, GA	557	2	4	0	6	8	20
7	TUSCALOOSA, AL	679	10	78	38	60	0	186

Appendix D.5 Hours Worked by Specific Activity: CWT Programs, First Half FY 2005, by Station

VISN	STATION	STATION CODE	SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT	TRANSITIONAL EMPLOYMENT	WORKSHOP OR JOB READINESS	ADMINISTRATIVE, EDUCATIONAL OR SUPERVISORY	OTHER ACTIVITIES	TOTAL HOURS OF INDIVIDUAL ACTIVITIES
8	BAY PINES, FL	516	0	60	0	60	0	120
8	MIAMI, FL	546	0	0	0	1	0	1
8	NO.FL/SO.GA VETERANS HCS: Gainesville	573	0	38	0	10	0	48
8	ORLANDO, FL	673OR	0	30	5	5	0	40
8	TAMPA, FL	673	0	72	0	108	0	180
8	WEST PALM BEACH, FL	548	0	41	5	14	0	60
9	LEXINGTON, KY	596	10	15	0	19	0	44
9	LOUISVILLE, KY	603	35	25	0	92	0	152
9	MEMPHIS, TN	614	0	50	0	5	0	55
9	MIDDLE TN HCS: Murfreesboro	626A4	0	39	0	1	0	40
9	MOUNTAIN HOME, TN	621	0	38	5	92	0	135
10	CHILLICOTHE, OH	538	80	10	35	70	20	215
10	CINCINNATI, OH	539	32	15	0	75	0	122
10	CLEVELAND, OH	541	0	140	40	162	0	342
10	COLUMBUS, OH	757	30	5	0	6	0	41
10	DAYTON, OH	552	0	8	0	7	2	17
11	ANN ARBOR (MI) HCS	506	0	103	0	24	100	227
11	BATTLE CREEK, MI	515	0	35	30	10	0	75
11	DANVILLE, IL	550	0	28	5	32	0	65
11	INDIANAPOLIS, IN	583	23	28	3	24	0	78
11	NORTHERN IN HCS: Marion	610	0	10	20	10	0	40
12	HINES, IL	578	150	22	0	148	60	380
12	MADISON, WI	607	0	50	0	30	35	115
12	MILWAUKEE, WI	695	0	87	25	109	100	321
12	NORTH CHICAGO, IL	556	22	30	0	55	0	107
12	TOMAH, WI	676	4	109	0	71	0	184
15	COLUMBIA, MO	589A4	14	14	4	8	0	40
15	EASTERN KANSAS HCS: Leavenworth	589A6	8	4	4	16	8	40
15	EASTERN KANSAS HCS: Topeka	589A5	0	30	5	18	7	60
15	KANSAS CITY, MO	589	20	24	20	20	0	84
15	POPLAR BLUFF, MO	657A4	2	2	0	2	0	6
15	ST. LOUIS (MO): Jefferson Barracks	657A0	15	15	0	10	0	40
16	CENTRAL AR VET. HCS: Little Rock	598	0	72	0	38	0	110
16	GULF COAST (MS) VET. HCS: Biloxi	520	17	78	0	110	20	225
16	HOUSTON, TX	580	0	40	0	40	8	88
16	JACKSON, MS	586	0	25	0	15	20	60
16	OKLAHOMA CITY, OK	635	0	30	0	20	220	270
17	CENTRAL TX VETERANS HCS: Temple	674	0	220	0	90	0	310
17	FORT WORTH, TX	549BY	30	69	15	5	74	80
17	NORTH TX HCS: Bonham	549A4	0	80	6	80	0	400
17	NORTH TX HCS: Dallas	549	0	0	40	15	200	215
17	NORTH TX HCS: Dallas-downtown	549DT	30	31	10	50	160	200
17	SOUTH TX VETERANS HCS: San Antonio	671	40	70	0	75	0	185

Appendix D.5 Hours Worked by Specific Activity: CWT Programs, First Half FY 2005, by Station

VISN	STATION	STATION CODE	SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT	TRANSITIONAL EMPLOYMENT	WORKSHOP OR JOB READINESS	ADMINISTRATIVE, EDUCATIONAL OR SUPERVISORY	OTHER ACTIVITIES	TOTAL HOURS OF INDIVIDUAL ACTIVITIES
18	EL PASO VA HCS	756	1	4	0	1	0	6
18	NEW MEXICO HCS: Albuquerque	501	0	30	2	22	4	58
18	NORTHERN ARIZONA HCS: Prescott	649	1	25	0	14	20	60
18	SOUTHERN AZ HCS (Tucson)	678	0	60	0	20	0	80
19	SALT LAKE CITY (UT) HCS	660	0	0	0	50	0	80
19	SHERIDAN, WY	666	1	35	0	30	0	65
19	SO. COLORADO HCS: Colorado Springs	567GB	30	3	0	8	0	12
20	ALASKA VA HCS: Anchorage	463	8	55	15	80	5	163
20	PORTLAND, OR	648	7	27	5	19	0	58
20	PUGET SOUND (WA) HCS: Tacoma	663A4	18	21	0	22	40	101
20	ROSEBURG (OR) HCS	653	22	11	0	36	0	69
20	ROSEBURG (OR) HCS: Eugene	653BY	4	8	4	8	0	24
20	WALLA WALLA, WA	687	0	23	3	4	10	40
20	WHITE CITY, OR	692	82	0	0	45	0	127
21	HONOLULU, HI	459	14	28	2	9	0	53
21	PALO ALTO (CA) HCS	640	10	175	0	30	85	300
21	SAN FRANCISCO (CA) Domiciliary	662BU	29	94	6	82	3	214
21	SIERRA NEVADA HCS: Reno	654	10	20	2	10	0	42
22	GREATER LA (CA) HCS	691	20	160	0	115	40	335
22	GREATER LA (CA) HCS: Sepulveda	691A4	20	17	10	10	67	124
22	LOMA LINDA, CA	605	0	47	0	65	0	112
22	LONG BEACH (CA) HCS	600	0	20	30	16	0	66
22	SAN DIEGO (CA) HCS	664	7	34	0	24	11	76
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: Eagle Butte	568HM	0	16	16	8	0	40
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: Fort Meade	568	9	62	16	60	5	152
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: Hot Springs	568A4	0	100	0	31	109	240
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: McLaughlin	568HK	5	5	5	105	0	120
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: Pine Ridge	568HF	3	20	2	15	160	200
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: Rapid City	568GA	10	20	0	0	10	40
23	CENTRAL IA HCS: Knoxville	636A7	4	25	0	10	0	39
23	FARGO, ND	437	0	7	0	11	0	18
23	MINNEAPOLIS, MN	618	48	6	0	64	0	118
23	NE-WESTERN IA HCS: Omaha	636	0	0	4	4	0	8
23	ST. CLOUD, MN	656	0	31	0	38	0	69
TOTAL HRS BY ACTIVITY			**1,420**	**5,252**	**609**	**4,793**	**2,054**	**14,128**
AVERAGE			**12.0**	**44.5**	**5.2**	**40.6**	**17.4**	**119.7**
SD			**23.5**	**41.3**	**10.0**	**41.1**	**39.9**	**94.8**
CV			**1.95**	**0.93**	**1.94**	**1.01**	**2.29**	**0.79**

Appendix D.6a Total Hours Worked: CWT Programs, First Half FY 2005, by VISN

VISN	TOTAL VA HOURS WORKED	TOTAL CONTRACT HOURS WORKED
1	1,147	70
2	672	40
3	858	112
4	1,094	80
5	606	0
6	430	0
7	1,028	70
8	509	0
9	491	0
10	969	0
11	483	85
12	1,098	80
15	306	0
16	675	200
17	1,655	0
18	236	0
19	169	0
20	736	40
21	610	20
22	990	40
23	1,219	40
TOTAL HOURS WORKED	**15,981**	**877**
AVERAGE	**761.0**	**41.8**
SD	**372.7**	**51.3**
CV	**0.49**	**1.23**

Appendix D.6b Total Hours Worked: CWT Programs, First Half FY 2005, by Station

VISN	STATION	STATION CODE	TOTAL VA HOURS WORKED	TOTAL CONTRACT HOURS WORKED
1	BEDFORD, MA	518	400	0
1	BOSTON (MA) HCS: Boston	523	68	0
1	BOSTON (MA) HCS: Brockton	523A5	132	0
1	CONNECTICUT HCS: West Haven	689	200	70
1	NORTHAMPTON,(Leeds) MA	631	196	0
1	PROVIDENCE, RI	650	119	0
1	WHITE RIVER JUNCTION, VT	405	32	0
2	ALBANY, NY	528A8	228	0
2	BATH, NY	528A6	82	0
2	CANANDAIGUA, NY	528A5	85	0
2	ROCHESTER, NY	528GE	40	0
2	SYRACUSE, NY	528A7	70	40
2	WESTERN NY HCS: Batavia	528A4	12	0
2	WESTERN NY HCS: Buffalo	528	155	0
3	BRONX, NY	526	80	32
3	HUDSON VALLEY (NY) HCS: Montrose	620	140	0
3	NEW JERSEY HCS: East Orange	561	120	0
3	NEW JERSEY HCS: Lyons	561A4	160	0
3	NEW YORK HARBOR HCS: Brooklyn	630A4	104	0
3	NORTHPORT, NY	632	254	80
4	BUTLER,PA	529	33	0
4	COATESVILLE, PA	542	546	0
4	LEBANON, PA	595	265	80
4	PITTSBURGH (PA) HCS	646A5	210	0
4	WILKES-BARRE, PA	693	40	0
5	MARTINSBURG, WV	613	196	0
5	MARYLAND HCS	512	90	0
5	MARYLAND HCS: Perry Point	512A5	100	0
5	WASHINGTON, DC	688	220	0
6	ASHEVILLE, NC	637	40	0
6	HAMPTON, VA	590	230	0
6	RICHMOND, VA	652	40	0
6	SALEM, VA	658	120	0
7	ATLANTA, GA	508	160	0
7	AUGUSTA, GA	509	142	70
7	BIRMINGHAM, AL	521	40	0
7	CENTRAL AL VETERANS HCS: Tuskegee	619A4	280	0
7	CHARLESTON, SC	534	40	0
7	COLUMBIA, SC	544	120	0
7	DUBLIN, GA	557	22	0
7	TUSCALOOSA, AL	679	224	0
8	BAY PINES, FL	516	120	0
8	MIAMI, FL	546	1	0
8	NO.FL/SO.GA VETERANS HCS: Gainesville	573	48	0
8	ORLANDO, FL	673OR	40	0
8	TAMPA, FL	673	220	0
8	WEST PALM BEACH, FL	548	80	0
9	LEXINGTON, KY	596	44	0
9	LOUISVILLE, KY	603	152	0
9	MEMPHIS, TN	614	55	0
9	MIDDLE TN HCS: Murfreesboro	626A4	40	0
9	MOUNTAIN HOME, TN	621	200	0

Appendix D.6b Total Hours Worked: CWT Programs, First Half FY 2005, by Station

VISN	STATION	STATION CODE	TOTAL VA HOURS WORKED	TOTAL CONTRACT HOURS WORKED
10	CHILLICOTHE, OH	538	315	0
10	CINCINNATI, OH	539	122	0
10	CLEVELAND, OH	541	472	0
10	COLUMBUS, OH	757	41	0
10	DAYTON, OH	552	19	0
11	ANN ARBOR (MI) HCS	506	160	69
11	BATTLE CREEK, MI	515	110	0
11	DANVILLE, IL	550	65	0
11	INDIANAPOLIS, IN	583	68	16
11	NORTHERN IN HCS: Marion	610	80	0
12	HINES, IL	578	400	0
12	MADISON, WI	607	115	0
12	MILWAUKEE, WI	695	270	80
12	NORTH CHICAGO, IL	556	115	0
12	TOMAH, WI	676	198	0
15	COLUMBIA, MO	589A4	40	0
15	EASTERN KANSAS HCS: Leavenworth	589A6	40	0
15	EASTERN KANSAS HCS: Topeka	589A5	80	0
15	KANSAS CITY, MO	589	100	0
15	POPLAR BLUFF, MO	657A4	6	0
15	ST. LOUIS (MO): Jefferson Barracks	657A0	40	0
16	CENTRAL AR VET. HCS: Little Rock	598	110	0
16	GULF COAST (MS) VET. HCS: Biloxi	520	227	0
16	HOUSTON, TX	580	128	0
16	JACKSON, MS	586	60	0
16	OKLAHOMA CITY, OK	635	150	200
17	CENTRAL TX VETERANS HCS: Temple	674	350	0
17	FORT WORTH, TX	549BY	80	0
17	NORTH TX HCS: Bonham	549A4	480	0
17	NORTH TX HCS: Dallas	549	320	0
17	NORTH TX HCS: Dallas-downtown	549DT	240	0
17	SOUTH TX VETERANS HCS: San Antonio	671	185	0
18	EL PASO VA HCS	756	6	0
18	NEW MEXICO HCS: Albuquerque	501	90	0
18	NORTHERN ARIZONA HCS: Prescott	649	60	0
18	SOUTHERN AZ HCS (Tucson)	678	80	0
19	SALT LAKE CITY (UT) HCS	660	80	0
19	SHERIDAN, WY	666	74	0
19	SO. COLORADO HCS: Colorado Springs	567GB	15	0
20	ALASKA VA HCS: Anchorage	463	204	0
20	PORTLAND, OR	648	71	0
20	PUGET SOUND (WA) HCS: Tacoma	663A4	146	0
20	ROSEBURG (OR) HCS	653	76	0
20	ROSEBURG (OR) HCS: Eugene	653BY	24	0
20	WALLA WALLA, WA	687	40	0
20	WHITE CITY, OR	692	175	40
21	HONOLULU, HI	459	56	0
21	PALO ALTO (CA) HCS	640	280	20
21	SAN FRANCISCO (CA) Domiciliary	662BU	224	0
21	SIERRA NEVADA HCS: Reno	654	50	0
22	GREATER LA (CA) HCS	691	590	0
22	GREATER LA (CA) HCS: Sepulveda	691A4	143	40
22	LOMA LINDA, CA	605	112	0
22	LONG BEACH (CA) HCS	600	66	0
22	SAN DIEGO (CA) HCS	664	79	0

Appendix D.6b Total Hours Worked: CWT Programs, First Half FY 2005, by Station

VISN	STATION	STATION CODE	TOTAL VA HOURS WORKED	TOTAL CONTRACT HOURS WORKED
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: Eagle Butte	568HM	40	0
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: Fort Meade	568	172	0
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: Hot Springs	568A4	240	0
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: McLaughlin	568HK	120	0
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: Pine Ridge	568HF	200	0
23	BLACK HILLS (SD) HCS: Rapid City	568GA	40	0
23	CENTRAL IA HCS: Knoxville	636A7	57	0
23	FARGO, ND	437	20	40
23	MINNEAPOLIS, MN	618	126	0
23	NE-WESTERN IA HCS: Omaha	636	8	0
23	ST. CLOUD, MN	656	196	0
TOTAL HOURS WORKED			**15,981**	**877**
AVERAGE			**135.4**	**7.4**
SD			**113.7**	**25.4**
CV			**0.84**	**3.41**